National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Service
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Services des thèses canadiennes

CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CANADIENNES

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL 339 (r. 86/01)

Canada

National Library of Canada | Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

220

TC –

0-315-23413-X

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE SERVICE – SERVICE DES THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

PERMISION TO MICROFILM – AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type – Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

AUTHOR – AUTEUR

Full Name of Author – Nom complet de l'auteur

Gudrun Bjork Gudsteins Hansen

Date of Birth – Date de naissance	Canadian Citizen – Citoyen canadien
Sept. 17, 1954	☐ Yes / Oui ☑ No / Non
Country of Birth – Lieu de naissance	**Permanent Address – Résidence fixe**
Iceland	Leirubakki 26 109 Reykjavik Ice

THESIS – THÈSE

Title of Thesis – Titre de la thèse

The 'Stone' As Poetic Justice in Robertson Davies' Deptford Trilogy

Degree for which thesis was presented Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée	Year this degree conferred Année d'obtention de ce grade
M.A.	1985
University – Université	**Name of Supervisor – Nom du directeur de thèse**
U. of A.	Prof. Dale Wilkie

AUTHORIZATION – AUTORISATION

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to **microfilm** this thesis and to **lend** or **sell copies of the film.**

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de **microfilmer** cette thèse et de **prêter** ou de **vendre des exemplaires du film.**

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

ATTACH FORM TO THESIS – VEUILLEZ JOINDRE CE FORMULAIRE À LA THÈSE

Signature	Date
Gudrun B. G. Hansen	Oct. 10, 1985

NL-91 (r. 84/03)

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE 'STONE' AS POETIC JUSTICE IN ROBERTSON DAVIES' DEPTFORD TRILOGY

by

GUDRUN BJORK GUDSTEINS

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1985

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Gudrun Bjork Gudsteins

TITLE OF THESIS: The 'Stone' as Poetic Justice in Robertson Davies' Deptford Trilogy

DEGREE: Master of Arts

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1985

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

Gudrun Bjork Gudsteins

546 Michener Park
Edmonton, Alberta
T6H 4M5

Date: Oct. 11, 1985

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled THE 'STONE' AS POETIC JUSTICE IN ROBERTSON DAVIES' DEPTFORD TRILOGY submitted by GUDRUN BJORK GUDSTEINS in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

M. Dale Wilkie
Supervisor

Date October 11, 1985

To my family.

ABSTRACT

Poetic justice in Robertson Davies' novels is a psychological, an aesthetic, and a theological principle, represented by the 'stone' in the Deptford trilogy. In my thesis I briefly examine Davies' expressed views on poetic justice, psychology, aesthetics, and theology before analyzing these aspects of Davies' novels. Poetic justice is central to the Salterton trilogy as a principle shaping theme, character, and plot in each novel but conflicting with Davies' use of a third person omniscient narrator. In all of Davies' fiction poetic justice works against onesidedness, moves the characters towards wholeness of being, a balance of dual extremes. In the Deptford trilogy, for the first time, Davies found in the 'stone' a symbol which unites the extremes, representing wholeness, as Jung defines it, as well as a transcendent power forming human destiny. In this trilogy Davies examines the negative psychological and spiritual effect that onesided ideals and ideologies have on individuals and society as a whole. He offers the concept of wholeness as a desirable alternative. The 'stone' is a symbol of wholeness of self—the center where the conscious and the unconscious unite and is one of the manifestations of man's religious instinct, indistinguishable from God.

Poetic justice is central to the confessional narrative in the Deptford trilogy and The Rebel Angels. Furthermore, poetic justice shapes plot and characterization in these later works. Through the 'stone' which is identical in meaning to the 'tree' in The Rebel Angels, Davies develops a subtext beneath a deceptively simple

surface. The interplay between maintext and subtext dramatizes the relationship between the conscious and the unconscious, man and God, orthodox Christianity and the ideal of wholeness. Davies explores this concept of wholeness in Jungian psychology, unorthodox branches of Christianity, alchemy and the realm of dream, myth, all of which are united in a center represented by the 'stone.' The subtext of the 'stone' enacts Davies' vision of the interrelatedness of psychology, aesthetics, and theology: medium and message are one.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my past and present instructors, and indeed my fellow students and friends, for their guidance in the maze of English language and literature. My special thanks go to Dr. Eileen Conway for sacrificing a weekend to assist a bumbling foreigner. Margaret Voice I thank for excellent typing. I am grateful to my committee members for their patience and understanding. Professor Dale Wilkie I am particularly indebted to. Her instruction aroused my interest in Canadian literature and the idea for this thesis sprang from a directed reading course she was kind enough to add to her already busy schedule. Professor Wilkie's support, encouragement, good counsel, and willingness to work the most uncivilized hours made possible my completion of this thesis in time for this fall's convocation: she has been an outstanding supervisor at all times.

Different but no less is my gratitude to my family. I wish to thank Sigrún Gudmundsdóttir, my mother, and other relatives for years of invaluable faith and support. Börkur Hansen, my husband, and my two children, Silja and Haukur, deserve a medal for their love, understanding, and most of all patience with an absent family member during my work on this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	POETIC JUSTICE IN THE SALTERTON TRILOGY	19
III	PURITY, WHOLENESS, AND POETIC JUSTICE IN THE DEPTFORD TRILOGY	38
IV	THE 'STONE': SYMBOL AND FORM IN THE DEPTFORD TRILOGY	73
V	CONCLUSION	124
NOTES		126
BIBLIOGRAPHY		131

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Poetic justice is a central element in Robertson Davies' fiction. Poetic justice is not only ideal justice, but an organizing principle which shapes the characters' destiny—moves them towards a wholeness of being. This concept of justice implies contending forces. Davies' depiction of such forces in his works, his novels in particular, reveals his gradual shift from social criticism to moralist concerns, as well as his artistic growth as a novelist. The movement from Tempest-Tost, which is primarily a light social satire, through Leaven of Malice where Davies examines the influence and the function of malice within society and the individual, to the more complex, subtle and focused examination of individual growth reflects his growing interest in the moral responsibility of the individual. In the Salterton novels as a whole, however, Davies focuses his examination on modern Canadian society within the broader context of humanity through representative characters. The Salterton novels are uneven in depth and focus. The element of poetic justice in theme, characterization and structuring of plot lends the novels a degree of unity, in addition to the more superficial one of consistent use of character and place.

In the Deptford trilogy and The Rebel Angels, Davies focuses his examination on the Christian individual in relation to the human race, past and future. He explores the chiaroscuro

of the inner life of his characters, the subtle interplay between the individual's inner nature in relation to universal human nature, the divine and the demonic, the conscious and the unconscious, the private and the public, acceptance and rejection, truth and illusion. These dual aspects coexist in the Deptford trilogy and strive at all times to join in equilibrium. Severe suppression or rejection of one aspect eventually, by the principle of poetic justice, brings its counterpart to the surface with a force perilous to the individual. In The Mirror of Nature Davies observes:

> The principle of melodrama is enantiodromia, an impressive Greek word for a simple and familiar thing, sometimes called Poetic Justice. The Greek word reminds us that the principle is of great antiquity; it was first enunciated by Heraclitus in the fifth century BC. All extremes, said he, tend to run into their opposites. This has been called the regulating function of antithesis. In common life, in drama, and in fiction, we know it as the way in which at last villains meet their downfall, the oppressed are given their due, and compensating factors are to be discerned in almost any human situation.[1]

The age of the word enantiodromia is roughly the same as the age of recorded drama; as Davies points out, the antiquity and the perseverance of the principle itself, not only in drama or fiction and poetry, but also in expressions of ordinary speech, suggests that it is indeed "a great principle of human life" (MN, p. 27). In the Salterton novels Davies focuses on a social group or an individual suddenly introduced to a force that either enhances or threatens life. In the Deptford

trilogy and The Rebel Angels, however, Davies emphasizes the forces themselves as they manifest themselves within the social group and the individual. He defines the transcendental powers that work upon man and through man, shaping his destiny. Thus Davies' focal point in the latter novels is increasingly theological.

Davies' theological emphasis is evident in his dismissal of "the writers who are enclosed in a kingdom of this world" in favour of "the authors who, overtly or by implication, write as if man lived in the presence of a transcendent authority, and of an Adversary who sought to come between him and the light."[2] Davies finds such writers in melodrama, which "offers its audiences one of the sweetest rewards that art has to give, and that is Poetic Justice" (OH, p. 198). Davies also points out that in ghost stories "ghosts are linked with [the] idea of Poetic Justice . . .; they are a manifestation of the deeply rooted notion that somehow and somewhere, every living creature should have his due, and if he cannot get it before death he may return to demand it after death" (OH, p. 277). In addition to granting ideal justice, poetic justice or "the principle of enantiodromia," Davies observes, "is the tendency of things to run into their opposites if they are exaggerated." He explains:

> Excessive self-love becomes no love at all; extreme prudence ends up by spoiling the ship for a ha'p'orth of tar; a rejection of all that is coarsely vital in life brings a shrivelling of sensibility. As a very eminent psychiatrist once said to me: "We attract what we fear." What we fear is the portion of life that remains unlived. Our task, if we seek

> spiritual wholeness, is to be sure that what has been rejected is not, therefore, forgotten, and its possibility wiped out. (OH, p. 240)

"[I]t is wholeness rather than perfection that" Davies is "interested in" and it is the individual's responsibility to help along the regulating force of poetic justice by recognizing or by exploring the unlived portion of life (OH, p. 268).

Like poetic justice, wholeness is an ideal. Davies observes:

> The concept of wholeness is so very great, so demanding of our uttermost powers of understanding, that most of us must be content to glimpse it, indirectly, so to speak, through art of some kind, and literary art as often as not. It is a benign concept, though many terrors are in the path of those who seek it. But because we recognize evil, and confront it as wisely as we may, we do not necessarily succumb to it. (OH, p. 269)

Wholeness is "the union of contraries, . . . that Mystical Marriage of Opposites . . . which Jung found in his investigation of the discarded writings of the Alchemists, and which he puts forward as the way of life in which the hope of mankind lies" (OH, p. 263). Davies compares Jung's definition of wholeness with John Cowper Powys' "'new humanity' in which he [Powys] sees 'the union of darkness and light, feeling and mind, the primitive and the civilized, wisdom and the happy heart'" (OH, p. 263). Davies points out that "this union of opposites is something different from the dualism which Christian theologians have condemned. It may not be any less a heresy, but that

is not for me to decide" (OH, p. 263). Thus Davies does not plead allegiance to any doctrine which elevates the one aspect of a pair of natural opposites and unquestioningly rejects the other. He favours the view that, for example, the realm of the spirit has both a benevolent and a malevolent side and that matter equally has its redemptive as well as its degrading side.

"If art makes me a Nestorian, a Manichee, a dualist, and probably a Gnostic—so be it," announces Davies (OH, p. 258). Davies quotes Powys on "'the necessity of opposites. Life and Death, Good and Evil, Matter and Spirit, Body and Soul, Reality and Appearance have to be joined together, have to be forced into one another, have to be proved dependent upon each other, while all solid entities have to dissolve. . . .'" (OH, p. 257). Davies expresses appreciation of Powys' Wolf Solent as "a work of art in which the vice and the virtue of the characters is interdependent, and where good and evil, though always in contention, will never fight to a lasting victory for one or the other" (OH, p. 258). Davies continues that

> . . . Wolf Solent is a novel of a time when we have seen the need to establish some reconciliation among opposites, not by attempting to alter their nature but by more clearly understanding their interdependence. . . . There are no Absolutes, but rather an infinitely complex mingling of contrarieties—at least in so far as such things can be ascertained by the means we possess. (OH, p. 258)

Davies adds, however: "A strong recognition of the interdependency of human creatures and moral concepts need not always lead to a recognition

of the sort of transcendent power in the universe that can be likened to the God of the Old or the New Testament" (OH, p. 258). He points out, for example, that the union of opposites in works like Powys' "is to happen in individual men, and be manifested through them" (OH, p. 263). Davies emphasizes:

> That is not what I have been hinting at . . .; I have been suggesting the existence of a power of good and a power of evil external to man, and working through him as an agency—a God, in fact, infinitely greater than man can conceive, and a Devil vastly more terrible than even the uttermost terrors of human evil. (OH, p. 264)

Thus Davies regards good and evil as necessary, interdependent opposites—"external to man" yet "working through him."

The central theme of Davies' lecture "The Devil's Burning Throne," in a series of lectures he delivered at Trinity College, Toronto, is "Evil in Literature with an examination of the roots of melodrama" (OH, p. 199). Davies explains:

> . . . melodrama is a very good place to start, because it shows clearly one or two things that are less obvious in more complex literary works. First, it shows us Evil as a requirement—indeed, a necessity—for a plot that will hold our attention and provoke our concern. Without Evil there is no tension, and without tension there is no drama. One of the things that makes the usual descriptions of Heaven so repulsive is that it is shown as a place utterly wanting in tension. Similarly, Hell is unbearable to contemplate because it is imagined as a place of

> unrelenting and agonizing tension. Our conception of human life is of a varying degree of tension between opposites. In melodrama this tension of opposites is displayed in a manner that is simplified, but not therefore falsified. In its simplified form it is a reflection, not of the surface of life, but of its underlying structure, and thus it satisfies us as a form of art. And thus, also, it resembles our dreams that arise from a realm within us not otherwise attainable, and understandable only from these symbolic messages. (OH, p. 199)

In short, the main values Davies finds in melodrama are that the genre acknowledges the existence of evil; it depicts a tension between good and evil where "the dividing line . . . may often be blurred, and . . . Good may often be the winner" and thus it gives a true reflection of the "underlying structure" of reality, which he elsewhere refers to as poetic justice or enantiodromia; and it is a symbolic mode, similar to dreams, which reflects a subsurface tension in the inner life, difficult to convey through means other than symbolic.

Davies' definition of wholeness as "a benign concept" has already been discussed. His references to evil, however, clarify his view of good and evil in man. Davies calls for a reexamination of the traditional view of evil:

> . . . the supposedly evil part of a character is not without its attraction and sympathetic spirit; the evil is as much a consequence of suppression, of having been disowned, as it is inherently wicked and unacceptable. This is the ambiguity of evil, a subject that few writers have been able to convey; but

> the ambiguity of evil, when we consider it, gives us a different conception of that much-maligned and grossly caricatured metaphysical power whom we speak of as the Devil. (OH, p. 236)

He points out that diabolical characters often represent "the unlived life, the inadmissible portion of a personality" which stands in the way of wholeness (OH, p. 236). Davies observes that "[v]ery often it is love . . ., but it may also be adventure, or a concern with the arts, or friendship, or simply a greater freedom of action" which become the "unlived life." These are sacrificed "to serve the demands of a career, or an idea of one's place in the world, or simply . . . to serve one's own comfort and egotism." Davies concludes that "these unlived elements revenge themselves and sometimes they do it with compounded interest" (OH, p. 239). Thus Davies suggests that the evil of the 'unlived life' most often stems from man's rejection of the humane and life affirming within himself; by the principle of enantiodromia the rejected part becomes a threat to the individual or society, until it gains recognition as a part of the whole.

Davies by no means denies the existence of evil, but he demands that traditional views of sin and evil be reexamined, as he indeed does himself in his later novels. Hatred, "selfishness, money-madness, sexual manipulation, and cold-hearted social climbing" are only a few of the aspects of evil; however, "the great Evil is to forget God, or to turn one's face from Him" (OH, pp. 205,261). Davies' conclusion in "Thunder Without Rain" suggests that he agrees with Graham Greene that "'God is suffering from the same evolution that

we are, but perhaps with more pain'" and that "'the evolution of God depends on our evolution. Evil act of ours strengthens his night-side, and every good one helps his day-side. . . . God when he is evil demands evil things. . . . But one day with our help He will be able to tear his evil mask off forever'" (OH, pp. 265-6). Davies' final lines include a quotation from Cowper Powys' Autobiography where Powys observes that"'though the First Cause may be both good and evil, a Power has risen out of it against which all the evil in it and all the unthinkable atrocities it brings to pass are fighting a losing battle'" (OH, p. 269). Given the view that God is going through an evolution, evil must be gradually losing its dark aspect, being redeemed; consequently, concepts of sin and evil must be continually examined. Also, a clear distinction must be made between the truly evil and the evils of the unlived life of an individual or a social group.

Davies gives Freud credit for being "one of the greatest liberators of the human mind in our history" (OH, p. 242). However, Davies accuses Freud of having "banished for many people the belief that a transcendent authority exists to which mankind is accountable for its actions" (OH, p. 244). Davies expresses concern at the moral decline ensuing from "[t]he supposed death of God" which "has loaded us with a new kind of guilt" (OH, p. 244). Davies finds that "personal responsibility" for evil or criminal actions "has almost vanished":

> Extraordinary horrors and indecencies are now regarded, not as simply evil, but as a consequence of some inequity in society, or in nature, for which we are all, in very vague

> terms, thought to be responsible, and against which, therefore, we should not seek redress. (OH, pp. 245,244)

Davies offers as an example that a "homicidal robber" in modern society is largely absolved of personal responsibility for his actions: "[a]ny notion that [he] may be the instrument of a force of Evil which is rather more than his personal psychological disturbance is rarely discussed, and the anti-God party does not want it to be discussed" (OH, p. 245). Davies observes: "The Freudian Revolution has dismissed, for those under its influence, the all-wise, all-loving Father; it has done nothing to rid them of the Devil, or the burden of guilt and fear that might suitably be considered as the Devil's realm" (OH, pp. 245-6). Modern man has thus disowned or rejected "what is beneficient" but accepted "as an inalienable burden" that which "is maleficent" (OH, p. 246). Davies draws the conclusion that "[u]nder the Freudian flag, the Devil has gained a good deal of ground, which was not, of course, what Freud intended" (OH, p. 245). Thus modern man banishes God, makes God an important part of his unlived life; by suppressing the benevolent aspects of the transcendent power man leaves himself open to its malevolent aspect which takes charge, by the principle of enantiodromia.

Davies emphatically dismisses as inadequate "all the modern clergy who want a God, but can't bear the notion of a Devil"; the Jungian point of view he finds more desirable (OH, p. 245).

> The Jungians assert the existence of God, but they have also sought to reexamine some beliefs which were long ago discarded by Christian orthodoxy. They have some good words for the

> Gnostics—who are hateful to orthodoxy. They have asserted that the alchemists were not wholly fools—which is detestable to modern science. And they suggest that the Devil is not a joke, and that he may be encompassed in the being of God . . . . (OH, p. 245)

Davies not only claims allegiance to a generally rejected idea by announcing faith in God, but also traces his ideas of God back to sources rejected as heretical. In discussing the rejected or unlived life Davies cautions that he "is not suggest[ing] that we should all obey every prompting of our desires, though it is healthy for us to give full attention to those desires which we will not fulfil, but which sometimes arise to plague us" (OH, p. 239). Davies emphasizes that "[w]e must be aware of the darker side of our natures. We must know what lurks in the shadows" (OH, p. 239). He quotes Goethe who "said that he had never heard of a crime which he could not imagine himself committing, under appropriate circumstances" and observes: "that is the sort of self-knowledge we should seek" (OH, p. 239). Hence Davies finds a solution to the modern dilemma of moral decline in the Jungian concept of wholeness, totality of self. He asserts that an essential part of wholeness is a recognition of the part of ourselves that we reject: "That realm of the unconscious, which is the dwelling-place of so many demons and monsters, is also the home of the Muses, the abode of the angels" (OH, p. 133). Hence the rejected part is both redemptive and demonic.

Furthermore, Davies' concept of wholeness includes a recognition of a transcendent authority to which we are accountable for our actions

and an awareness of "the dangerous and terrifying side of the supernatural as the shadow of its redemptive side" (OH, p. 236). Davies' depiction of poetic justice as the manifestation of a governing, organizing principle which works in mysterious ways reflects his preoccupation with these moral concerns.

Davies clearly declares his priorities as a writer: "[M]y novels are a moralist's novels," says Davies, and in his definition of a moralist he points out:

> A moralist is one who looks at human conduct with as clear an eye as he can manage, and says what he sees, drawing, now and then, a few tentative conclusions. He is not necessarily someone who beats the drum for a particular code of conduct, someone who rebukes what he believes to be sin, someone who looks down on people who are driven by passion, craving, or fear. . . .
>
> Of course he will be driven now and then to come to a few conclusions, but he will be cautious about giving them a too general application. He will observe that quite often people reap what they have sown. (OH, p. 1)

Although poetic justice is central in theme, structure of plot and characterization in the Salterton novels, on the whole they lack the depth and organic tightness of the Deptford trilogy; the third person, omniscient, narrative voice undermines the element of poetic justice The wholeness towards which poetic justice moves is best conveyed symbolically, as Davies does for the first time in the Deptford trilogy. There the principle of poetic justice is the center for

all the major elements. Theme, narrative situation, structure of plot and characterization in the Deptford trilogy all relate to a central symbol, dual in nature which represents poetic justice and shapes all elements.

Indeed, as Davies concludes his definition of the moralist's concerns, he offers the Deptford trilogy as an example:

> If he is honest he will admit that it is sometimes very difficult to know what they [people] have sown, or to be certain what the harvest is.
>
> That is the principal theme of my trilogy. I began it because for many years I had been troubled by a question: to what extent is a man responsible for the outcome of his actions, and how early in life does the responsibility begin? I concluded, not without long debate, that it began with life itself, and that a child was as responsible as anyone else if it chose a course of action knowingly. In Fifth Business, in the first few lines, a boy makes a choice: he wants to hurt his companion, so he throws a snowball at him, and in the snowball is a stone. . . . The consequences of the snowball with the stone in it continue for sixty years, and do much to shape the lives of three men, and in a lesser way to influence the lives of many people whom they encounter. (OH, pp. 16-17)

This commentary shows how central the stone was to the artistry and thought of the trilogy.

For Davies the 'stone' not only symbolizes poetic justice as

"the principal theme of [his] trilogy"; but also, it is the symbolic device unifying theme, narrative situation, structuring of plot, and characterization—and thus it dramatizes the principle it represents. Three main definitions of the principle of poetic justice may be summed up from the examples above. Firstly, poetic justice is an ideal distribution of rewards and punishments, or as Davies puts it: "you reap what you sow." Secondly, implicit in the principle of poetic justice is a certain duality of contending forces: by the principle of enantiodromia, extremes tend to run into their opposites. Lastly, the principle of poetic justice may lead towards a union of opposites in a central point. The focus in this examination of the Deptford trilogy is on Davies' use of the 'stone' as a symbolic device which dramatizes the balancing of opposing elements and represents totality.

In his writings C. G. Jung traces the history and the psychological significance of the 'stone' as it appears, for example, in myths, the Bible, alchemy, fairytales, and dreams. The history of the philosopher's stone is thus an important part of the history of the archetypal 'stone' which is one of the main symbols of order and totality of self, visually depicted at the center of a mandala: the 'stone' represents the center where the conscious and the unconscious unite. Jung explains that the self "is a God-image, or at least cannot be distinguished from one."[3] Davies adopts Jung's interpretation of the archetypal stone in the Deptford trilogy. The stone in the snowball is identical with the philosopher's stone: one is the objective, the other is the subjective representation of the archetypal

stone's power to transform, balance and unite.

Through the ages the stone has had a mystical significance in myth, folk lore and tales, superstition, and religion. The stone is also man's oldest known weapon and used for punishment. Furthermore, Jung notes that a stone is often to be found at the center of mandalas which are ideal depictions of the totality of self. The concept of the philosopher's stone, however, is peculiar to alchemy. It refers to either the transformational powers of a liquid or soluble material, or a redemptive transformation of spirit and matter. The philosopher's stone was believed to restore youth and lengthen life. In particular, Jung regards the alchemists whose sole interest was in producing an elixir which transforms base metals into precious ones as "charlatans, simpletons, and swindlers" (CW 12, par. 424). The alchemists whose tracts and illustrations interested Jung used the transformation process to stimulate their imagination in search for the "gold" hidden within through "'an inner dialogue with someone unseen'" (CW 14, par. 649). According to Jung the philosopher's stone represents the mystical marriage of opposites: the union of anima/animus and shadow within the unconscious; the union of the male and the female; the unconscious and the conscious, spirit and matter; the upper regions with the lower, good and evil, life and death, and so forth. The philosopher's stone is thus hermaphroditic, and it represents both the process of individuation and the wholeness towards which the process works—a totality of self. Jung observes that "the self can appear in all shapes from the highest to the lowest, inasmuch as these transcend the scope of the ego

personality in the manner of a daimonion" (CW 9ii, par. 356). The 'stone' as representative of the self is identical to Mercurius, the animals representing Mercurius, the hero, the philosophical egg, and the philosophical tree.

According to Jung, the 'stone' is a pointer to both a past and a future state of wholeness. Jung encounters recurring patterns of wholeness in his empirical studies of, for instance, dreams, visions, fantasies, the arts and alchemy. Orthodox Christian religion does not, however, accept the concept of wholeness but instead elevates certain aspects of spirit and emphatically rejects as impure the body and the aspects of spirit related to matter. Jung sees the philosopher's stone as the alchemists' attempt to unite their Christian faith and their inborn attraction to wholeness:

> It is a half physical, half metaphysical product, a psychological symbol expressing something created by man and yet supra-ordinate to him. This paradox can only be something like the symbol of the self, which likewise can be brought forth, i.e., made conscious, by human effort but is at the same time by definition a pre-existent totality that includes the conscious and the unconscious. (CW 14, par. 649)

The alchemists draw a parallel between Christ and the 'stone,' attempting to make Christ's perfection more approachable for human beings. Jung observes, however: "It is not difficult to see what kind of conscious situation the lapis philosophy [the philosopher's stone] compensates: far from signifying Christ, the lapis complements the common conception of the Christ figure at that time" (CW 13,

par. 127). Through the philosopher's stone the alchemists saw themselves involved in the redemption of matter and the redemption of God through matter; "for the alchemists matter had a divine aspect," and they were "interested in the fate and manifest redemption of substances . . ." (Jung, CW 14, par. 766; 12, par. 420). Jung comments on the unity of the 'stone':

> What the nature is of that unity which in some incomprehensible way embraces the antagonistic elements eludes our human judgement, for the simple reason that nobody can say what a being is like that unites the full range of consciousness with that of the unconscious. (CW 14, par. 518)

Thus the stone represents the known as well as the unknown which cannot be otherwise conveyed; it represents "the power of fate" as well as the wholeness to which man is fated (Jung, CW 14, par. 640).

The duality of the 'stone' in the Deptford trilogy plays a central role in Davies' thematic development of poetic justice; the relationship between spirit and matter is of particular importance: obsession with one aspect leads the characters, by the principle of poetic justice, into its opposite. Furthermore, the duality of the 'stone' is reflected in the narrative situation and the structuring of plot. The movement of the philosopher's stone from one side to its opposite shapes the narrative situation: the main characters feel that they must confess—reveal the hidden side of themselves. Similarly, the plot is structured as a series of reversals of actions and situations. Eventually, the opposite aspects of the philosopher's stone collide. The collision leads

either to a union of the opposites or their destruction. Individuation demands a heroic effort and Davies depicts it as a heroic quest, a continual mythic death and rebirth of the hero. The collison between opposites Davies depicts as the hero's battle with monsters or animals or as a battle between two animals. The archetypes belong to the personal unconscious as well as the collective unconscious and the characters' capacity to draw on their past and differentiate between the personal and the collective determines how they fare in the battle between the opposites: if they cannot take responsibility for their own past they fall victim to the collective unconscious and so experience regression and destruction. The truly heroic gain the treasure within—the wholeness of the 'stone.' Thus the 'stone' as poetic justice represents an organizing principle which shapes the characters' fate. Each character's capacity to accept his fate and the transcendental power behind it is crucial to his physical and spiritual welfare.

For a more comprehensive insight into the function and meaning of poetic justice in Davies novels I will briefly examine poetic justice in the Salterton novels before analyzing the Deptford trilogy. Since The Rebel Angels is equally focused on the theological significance of the 'stone' as poetic justice, I will briefly examine that novel.

Chapter II

POETIC JUSTICE IN THE SALTERTON TRILOGY

Davies' earlier works reveal his faith in symbolism as an appropriate expression of universal truths. In A Masque of Aesop, for example, Davies has Apollo insist: "But we [the Olympian Gods] move among you, you know, and have our way with you, though you do not usually recognize us."[4] Despite his playfulness, Davies' message is clearly that the gods in classical mythology express universal truths. Apollo demonstrates that "heavily disguised though they are," the gods are to be found in the audience, in some likely or unlikely form and that fable also expresses inner truths about human beings (MA, p. 9). The conclusion of a profile Davies wrote on Hans Christian Andersen in the Toronto Daily Star stresses the value of the fabular form: "His strength lay in one of the rarest of endowments in the whole realm of literature; he was a fabulist, and all his poetry and whimsicality, great though these attributes are, were put at the service of that extraordinary gift."[5]

Myth and fable are by no means the only forms Davies draws on to express universal human nature. In the Salterton novels Davies uses characters, types, and situations drawn from drama, poetry, romance, legend, and folklore. Obvious allusions serve as a short-hand, either for an economical definition of character and situation or for an ironic twist arising from characters' failure to identify what lies beneath the surface. Pearl Vambrace's name in Tempest-Tost

and Leaven of Malice is a good example of such shorthand reference to both character and situation. In Tempest-Tost Pearl is the gem whose value goes unrecognized, except for Valentine Rich who perceives her as "a girl with possibilities" and "an arresting" face with "the still, expectant look of one listening to an inner voice."[6] Also, by alluding to the fourteenth-century poem "Pearl," Davies places Professor Vambrace in Tempest-Tost in the role of a father who has difficulties resigning himself to his "little" daughter having a "destiny apart from" her "Father" (TT, p. 129). Ironically, Vambrace, as Davies develops in Leaven of Malice, opposes his daughter's entrance into adult life and growth and wants her to follow him and his wife into the world of the living dead, in contrast to the father in "Pearl" who rages against his daughter's death, in which he attempts to join her. Eventually Professor Vambrace, like the father in "Pearl," has to come to his senses and allow his daughter to enter a world apart from his own. Pearl's rejection of her first name in favour of Veronica, which means "true image" indicates the symbolic death of "Father's" little girl, the theme of the poem. Most of Davies' allusions in Tempest-Tost and Leaven of Malice, however, refer to drama, more particularly, Shakespeare who drew liberally on folklore, legend, romance, and history. In A Mixture of Frailties Davies also alludes to Shakespeare, and to romantic or fantastic poetry and stories which become themes for Giles Revelstoke's operas or touchstones for Monica Gall's development as an artist.

Although effective as shorthand methods for comparison and contrast of characters and situations, Davies' allusions, above all,

reveal his interest in typology. Davies refers to Shakespeare as "that supreme melodramatist" and declares that Shakespearean drama, in common with romance and opera, "is not Realism which is an imitation of surfaces"; and he adds, "dream-figures and archetypal involvements" which belong to the "dreams of the tribe" are more likely to be found in melodrama, romance, and opera, which Davies classifies as a "modern [form] of melodrama" (OH, pp. 181,146,147,199). Most of the works Davies evokes in the Salterton novels are fantastic, mystical, legendary, or folkloric. Although fantastic, or rather because of their disregard of realism, these works express man's inner nature through archetypal images and patterns appropriate to the inner life of the modern Salterton characters. This view of the relationship between man's inner life and his literary and mythic inheritance" "suggest[s] a natural affinity with Jung," as Patricia Monk points out and develops at length in The Smaller Infinity. She continues:

> The affinity with Jung manifests itself in Davies' preoccupations with subjects bordering on psychology but not included in it, which are products of what may roughly be termed the 'spirit' in humankind.[7]

In her book Monk convincingly demonstrates that Davies' affinity with Jung precedes his familiarity with Jung's work. She observes: "In his discussions of folklore, myth, literature, magic, and romance, Davies can repeatedly be found in agreement with Jung and disagreement with Freud" (p. 9). Monk dates Davies' first signs of interest in Jung rather than Freud at around 1958.

Monk concludes her examination of Davies' "progressive attempt to

define human identity in the fullest possible sense" by asserting that he "eventually moves beyond his affinity with Jung to a more impartial assessment of Jungianism as simply one way of looking at the universe, one myth among a number of others, and finally he is able to present the Jungian self as only one among several concepts of complete human identity" (p. 182). In a "review Essay" of Monk's book Frederick Radford calls attention to a weakness in her premise for the statement that Davies is moving away from Jung to alternative "modes of myth and romance":

> The conclusions seem to depend on a belief in a division between Jung's theories of the personality and the patterns of myth and romance that are so commonly pointed to by him and his followers as transformations of elements of the personality in its quest for individuation. It becomes puzzling indeed when an opposition is set up between Jungian thought and Joseph Campbell's studies of the hero-journey, which are conventionally regarded as Jungian in inspiration just as Campbell himself is known as a major elucidator and follower of Jung. The flaw in Monk's argument here may be that she seems to equate the whole body of Jungian thought with the narrower field of therapy.[8]

Citing David Staunton in The Manticore as an example, Radford suggests a more perceptive way of understanding the Jungian elements that also inform The Rebel Angels:

> Perhaps the real division that Davies is making is not between Jungian theory and some other formulation, but between theoretical awareness of psychic processes, on the intellectual level, as

> probable elements in one's own psychological life, and the actual experience of such processes on the level of the feelings. . . . But none of this is a rejection of the larger canon of Jung's thought as a source for structural elements of the psychic life of fictional characters. (p. 485)

Indeed the Jungian concept of wholeness is at the very center of The Rebel Angels. Jung as a psychiatrist was confined by empirical studies; Davies as an artist is free to celebrate the inherent justness of the transcendent power that shapes human fate, leading him towards wholeness.

Although the major theorist within the field of psychology on the significance of myth, religion, alchemy, and art as expressions of the collective unconscious, Jung was by no means the first to regard these as worthy of study. The Egyptian and Persian folktales Arabian Nights' Entertainment or The Thousand and One Nights, believed to be recorded about the fifteenth century, were translated into English in the nineteenth century. The brothers Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm collected German folktales which were published around 1813 and translated into English in 1832. Although such recovery of folklore became popular in the early nineteenth century, it was not until the late nineteenth and early twentieth century that interest in universal patterns and a study of their significance increased in the wake of Sir J. G. Frazer's publication of The Golden Bough (1890-1915). Universal symbols, rituals, forms, types, or patterns became an area of exploration, not only within anthropology but also, for example, within religion, philosophy, psychology, linguistics, and literature.

An interesting similarity may, for example, be discerned between Jung's archetypes, Vladimir Propp's classification of characters' "spheres of action" in folktales, and Etienne Souriau's classification of characters' "dramatic functions" in drama.[9] "Propp, working in the 1920's, may be classed with the Russian formalists," so he was unlikely to have been influenced by Jung.[10] Souriau published his findings in 1950 and may have been aware of either Propp's or Jung's findings, but not necessarily.[11] The similarities most likely stem from a similarity in perspective: all three theories define recurrent or universal patterns of what Jung calls the collective unconscious. Jung, however, goes beyond mere classification and definition, and offers psychological interpretation of the archetypes.

Nevertheless, a great deal of interaction may be discerned between the various humane disciplines on the significance of universal patterns: valuable discoveries and interpretations within one discipline are adopted by others and thus enriched, so that in many ways their development is collective. For instance, Robert Scholes points out the reciprocal influences between linguistics and structuralism to the benefit of both. Also, Northrop Frye comments on Jung's Symbols of Transformation: "The themes and patterns of this book are strikingly similar to those of Frazer's Golden Bough."[12] Frye continues that "The Golden Bough was intended to be a book on anthropology, but it was also a book on literary criticism, and seems to have had far more influence in literature than in its alleged field."[13] In his lectures on nineteenth century melodrama in The Mirror of Nature Davies, however, suggests a reverse pattern, one where literature

illuminates psychology:

> Psychology and literature are never far apart, and many works of greater or lesser significance during the nineteenth century made it clear that what Freud had encountered in the consulting room, writers had observed and understood intuitively in their work. . . . Ibsen holds the mirror up to nature in a way that many people could not endure, and his insights are Freudian, or perhaps we should say pre-Freudian. So far as we know, Ibsen never heard of Sigmund Freud. . . . But Freud knew about Ibsen, as those who have read his work in detail are well aware. (MN, pp. 28-9)

Thus Davies emphasizes the reciprocity between literature and psychology. Freud's indebtedness to literature Davies relishes in particular since Freud declared the arts as manifestations of mental disturbances.

In his lectures on melodrama in One Half of Robertson Davies, as well as in The Mirror of Nature, Davies gives numerous examples of literary intuition anticipating Jungian theory. After discussing "Jungian elements" in Lord Byron's Manfred Davies concludes: "There they all are, the Jungian Theatre Company of the Archetypes, acting out their accustomed roles, and speaking in Byronic verse of a high order" (OH, p. 150). "The greatest art brings us near to the archetypal ideas themselves," says Davies, but Jung realized the psychological value of archetypes—in dreams, art, myth, alchemy, and religion. Hence Davies expresses regret that "criticism of the arts springing from the thought of C. G. Jung has been much less familiar"

than Freudian criticism. Davies adds that "Jung was drawn toward literary criticism himself: it creeps into his scientific writing repeatedly and we may ask ourselves how much he may have repressed in order that the ideal of science might be served" (OH, p. 144). Davies explains that he "had to make up [his] mind about [his] allegiance to Freud" who rejects "all the insights of art and literature" as "illusion" and rejects "God [as] an obsessional neurosis of which mankind must be cured" (OH, pp. 243,242). "Jung's depth psychology, on the other hand, is much more aesthetic and humanistic in its tendency, and is not so Procrustean in its effect on artistic experience" (OH, p. 126).

Davies sees religion and aesthetics, which Freud rejected in preference for science, as closely related and of great importance:

> . . . religion . . . engaged the lifelong attention of men and women of the highest intellectual quality—not only saints but philosophers, historians, poets, and warriors who found in it a pattern for life, a form into which they could put life, an order which was not imposed upon life but which arose from it. I do not say that only religion can do this; but I think something should give form, purpose, and—if you like—style to our lives. (OH, p. 72)

In his drama and novels Davies expresses through poetic justice his appreciation of and belief in "a pattern," "a form," "an order" inherent in life: "enantiodromia is the understructure of a mighty truth" (MN, p. 28).

Davies' use of a Jungian framework in the Deptford trilogy is

no secret. Jung's primary concern as a psychologist was man's responsibility to his own inner self; he perceived the necessity that the sound and sane, as well as the mentally imbalanced, must gain some insight into their unconscious and thus move towards a totality of self. As Davies points out, Jung and his followers acknowledge the existence of a transcendental power—divinely benign yet with a demonic shadow side to its nature. Jung, however, focuses his examination on the relationship between man's conscious and unconscious. Davies, on the other hand, is a moralist and his primary concern is man's dual responsibility to himself and to others; most importantly he focuses on man's responsibility to the autonomous transcendental being which works through the individual. Davies makes clear that he does not want to attempt to define God and that he indeed finds such definitions "a pompous and self-defeating exercise. I am content that God should encompass me: I do not think it likely that I shall encompass Him. Where God is concerned, I am the object, not the subject" (OH, p. 243). Davies explains that to him the name God encompasses "all the great and inexplicable things and the redemptive or destructive powers that lie outside human command and understanding" (OH, p. 127). Poetic justice in Davies' works reflects his emphasis "that the unseen and the unchancy stands very close to us, and we never know when it may assert itself even in our well-managed and somewhat commonplace lives" (OH, p. 239).

The difference between human and poetic justice is central in A Masque of Aesop. The citizens of Delphi show greater interest in punishment than fair trial when they demand that Aesop be killed.

Apollo, however, looks beyond the "arrogance of [Aesop's] wisdom" and his "scorn of men," grants Aesop the citizens' recognition of him "as a noble teacher" yet passes this sentence upon him: "For centuries to come your writings shall be the delight of children, but only the wisest among them will remember your fables and interpret them wisely when childhood is past" (MA, p. 47). Being a god, Apollo passes a sentence of poetic justice: its power of reward and punishment transcends Aesop's life and death; it involves a just balance between reward and punishment; and it transforms the negative aspects of Aesop's fables into "Truth and Light" (MA, p. 47). Apollo's assertion, discussed above, that the gods are here and now must not be forgotten, however, since it suggests that poetic justice also exists beyond the world of the masque.

In each of the three Salterton novels Davies evokes poetic justice in an epigraph from which he takes the title. In the epigraph to Tempest-Tost one of the witches in Macbeth voices her glee that a puny human is unwittingly about to be her helpless, "tempest-tost" victim. Hector Macilwraith is indeed, by the principle of enantiodromia, a helpless victim to a side of himself he has long ingored. "His cup of professional ambition was filled at a moment when he hankered after other, strange delights" (TT, p. 40) signals that his emotional, nonrational side is beginning to erupt with tempestuous force. The epigraph to Leaven of Malice also evokes superhuman powers. Instead of the chanted spell of a witch, however, the epigraph is a prayer to God asking for support to resist evil in His ervice. In this novel, Davies also suggests that evil (malice) which spreads like

contamination may have cathartic powers and generate "pureness of living and truth." Hence the witch's spell and the leaven of malice both represent evil forces which are necessary to the inner growth of individual characters. Similarly the epigraph to A Mixture of Frailties suggests that "a Mixture of some Frailties" is a necessary prerequisite for "Gentleness" in human nature. This epigraph does not, like the other two, evoke superhuman powers which control and shape the destiny of man; it is nonetheless a reminder of poetic justice: "It is by them [a Mixture of some Frailties] that we are best told that we must not strike too hard upon others because we ourselves do so often deserve blows." Experience and acceptance of the mixture of frailties in herself and others is the core of Monica Gall's education in Britain. As Sir Benedict Domdaniel advises Monica, she goes through a "process of vocal and spiritual unbuttoning" with Murtagh Molloy, and emotional and physical "unbuttoning" with Giles Revelstoke who asserts that she "must be ready to make a painful exploration of [herself]" to understand the language of poetry and music.[14] Through her exposure to human frailties, or depths of pain, as well as the heights of pleasure, Monica gains in vocal range, emotional depth, and analytical powers.

In the Salterton novels a definite pattern emerges in the epigraphs: they emphasize the regulating power of poetic justice. Severe suppression of emotions, in the case of Hector Macilwraith, eventually leads him into a tempestuous confusion, contrary to his controlled rationality, before he reaches a desirable balance between emotion and reason. Similarly, in Leaven of Malice, contrary to Higgin's

intent, the malice he introduces into Salterton has cathartic effects, reveals the main characters' motives for wanting to save "Face," and leads to a more natural order. For example, Pearl breaks away from her father's unnatural grip as Ridley does from his sense of unworthiness for accidentally causing his wife's mental collapse. Higgin's name is important here: it is a type name for a servant, suggesting that he serves a transcendental power by activating poetic justice. In A Mixture of Frailties Monica eventually realizes that her "depression, a sense of unworthiness, and a fear . . . of a spiritless mediocrity" preceding a performance is an inheritance from her mother, inseparable from her artistic heritage (p. 298). She also realizes in a dream that she deserted Giles Revelstoke when she might have saved his life because her instinct for survival warned her of his potential to destroy her. Monica does, however, acknowledge her share of responsibility for his death. This recognition of her frailties grants her strength tempered with gentleness.

The relationship between the epigraphs and thematic development in the Salterton novels reveals a significant aspect of "the mighty truth" of which poetic justice is "the understructure." The relationship between the Christian epigraph in Leaven of Malice and Davies' thematic variations on it within the novel are his clearest statements that a mighty truth, or God's will, may be served by the impure—malicious—no less than by the pure. The relation between epigraphs and thematic development in the other two novels further expresses Davies' dual vision. Davies rejects, with increasing emphasis, the vision of a complete split

between the mundane and the fantastic, intellect and feeling, spirit and body, good and evil. He demonstrates that the fantastic is another facet of the mundane; that feeling no less than reason must be accepted; that a full acceptance of the body enhances the spirit; and that evil may be the necessary catalyst of good. The evocation to superhuman powers in each epigraph is a unifying device within each novel, and the trilogy as a whole. The evocations relate to poetic justice which shapes the structure of plot in each novel.

In a Shakespearean manner the world of each Salterton novel is thrown out of balance. Davies frames the loss of equilibrium, descent into chaos, and eventual restoration of balance in each novel by characters and incidents which initially are only marginal to the central action. The focal characters and situations in the opening of all three novels parallel the main characters in the central action; the conclusion unites the framing and the central actions.

Fredegonde Webster's secret brewing of champagne cider in Tom Gwalchman's "Shed" establishes the frame in Tempest-Tost. She is midway between a child and an adult, yet her interest in and knowledge about wine and books indicate maturity beyond her age. Hector Macilwraith is middle aged, yet emotionally immature and inexperienced. Freddy mistakes Hector for a Caliban, threatening Griselda's virtue; Hector sees himself as a Ferdinand, vying for her love. Freddy's passionate love for books leads her to Valentine Rich's auction in the hope that she will get the box of old books she guesses to be immensely rare and valuable. Hector, led by his passionate love for Griselda, goes to the auction hoping that the Victorian novels his

lady love assumes are in the box will win her heart. Although Hector has no greater success with the books than Freddy, he gains the reputation for heroic astuteness, which rightfully belongs to her. In his suicide attempt Hector's old self dies a symbolic death and he collapses into Freddy's bottles of cider, hidden in the shed. Baptized in the spirits of "the Infant Bacchus" Hector arises from the fumes purged, in balance, and at peace with himself. The frame closes on Freddy's acceptance that her apple cider is not champagne and Hector's parallel realization that his love affair with Griselda was only a fantasy about someone who "was not much more than a child" (TT, p. 283).

Gloster Ridley's editorial concerns and excited anticipation of an honorary doctoral degree are central to the opening in Leaven of Malice. Like Professor Vambrace, Ridley is obsessed with honour which he later recognizes as his way to make up for a feeling of guilt for his wife's condition and a sense of unworthiness. Ironically, in his acceptance speech for the honorary doctor's degree, Ridley intends to quote All's Well that Ends Well in which Bertram's main flaw is a greater respect for name and title than for virtue.[15] Like Pearl Vambrace, however, he has difficulties with breaking away from a father figure, only his is a professional predecessor, Mr. Swithin Shillito. The upheaval caused by Mr. Higgin's malicious announcement releases both of them from the emotional scruples which bind them to the past. The novel which opened with a false announcement of an upcoming marriage between Pearl Vambrace and Solomon Bridgetower closes with a real one and Ridley's restoration of Vambrace's obituary which

he changed while under the spell of malice. Davies develops Ridley's dilemmas more subtly than those of the other characters and the narrative point of view remains closer to him; his crises and resolutions serve as commentary on the other characters' parallel situations.

Mrs. Bridgetower's death, her funeral on December 23, and the conditions of her will establish the frame for A Mixture of Frailties: Solly and Veronica Bridgetower find themselves with a house and servants to maintain but lack the necessary funds until they have a male heir. Through the intervention of Humphrey Cobbler, Monica Gall, the main character in the central plot, becomes the recipient of the rapidly growing trust fund from Mrs. Bridgetower's legacy, until Solly and Veronica have a son. Mrs. Bridgetower's lack of nourishing love for Solly and her determination to have the last word, even in death, threaten to make him hard and bitter. Monica finds the same will to control and lack of love in Giles Revelstoke. Amy Neilson's warning to Monica might also apply to Solly: "it's having your feelings hurt until they scar over that makes you coarse and ugly. You're not the temperament to survive that sort of thing" (p. 244). The duration of the trust fund is an educational period for both Solly and Monica. Solly learns to be more assertive and, more importantly, to put love and understanding of life and people above money and having his own way. Monica learns to feel and to recall feeling in distilled form for her art, yet no less important is her acceptance of herself, body as well as spirit, frailties as well as strengths. Solly and Monica accept the past and learn from

it instead of battling against it. By the conclusion mutual respect and care have developed between the Bridgetowers and Monica. Solly has to come to terms with his mother's intent to deprive him of any legacy. He gains, however, a healthy son and marriage, as well as wealth, and the capacity to resist, yet forgive, evil. Monica, however, initially resists her mother's influence and turns away from Giles; eventually she accepts their legacy as the voices that temper her romantic spirit. The frame closes on St. Nicholas' Day with the Dean's sermon on education, for which he has chosen the Wise Men at Christ's nativity to demonstrate his theme of the necessity of "learning and dedication" as preparation for the apprehension of "great mysteries" (p. 377). Against the sermon Davies balances Solly's and Monica's recognition of the need for redemption: Solly prays for the redemption of his mother's soul and Monica feels in need for redemption when she finally admits the "pang of relief, of release" at Giles' death (p. 373).

Hence Davies develops two interrelated main plots and two sets of main characters in each Salterton novel. At first these seem only superficially related, but they provide parallel commentary on each other and are eventually united in the conclusion. Davies' dual structuring of main plots and characters and the descent into chaos and darkness preceding a restoration of order and clarity of vision dramatize his theme of poetic justice.

Davies' narrative technique in the Salterton novels, however, especially the first two, undermines the significance of poetic justice. The omniscient narrator frequently passes uncompromising

judgement on minor characters in Leaven of Malice, yet especially in Tempest-Tost. The narrator's superhuman powers of perception are too close to the powers behind the poetic principle; the judgements he passes might be interpreted as identical with poetic justice and thus irrefutable if it were not for their very human sound. Poetic justice is an inherently ironic technical device, as it even counters the characters' best intentions. This device is most effective when characters and their actions speak for themselves; the judgemental narrative comments are intrusive and pompous at times. The title and the epigraph to A Mixture of Frailties herald a change in Davies' attitude to shortcomings in individuals and society. In A Mixture of Frailties Davies emerges as a moralist, as he defines one (OH, p. 16). Social criticism has been more prevalent in his two earlier novels and occasionally he has indeed beaten "the drum for a particular code of conduct, . . . rebuke[d] what he believes to be sin" or folly, and "look[ed] down on people who are driven by passion, craving, or fear" (OH, p. 16). The narrator in A Mixture of Frailties mostly refrains from passing overt judgement on characters and situations and is thus less intrusive than in the other two novels; Davies now either allows the characters to betray their folly or capacity for evil in a way that calls for no further comment or he has other characters voice their criticism upon the matter. The judgemental attitude of the omniscient narrator towards some of the minor characters and their actions in the first two Salterton novels undermines the very principle of poetic justice. In his godlike omniscience the narrator offers one side only instead of judgements which take into account the redeeming as well as

the condemming aspects of the character or the situation, as Apollo does in A Masque of Aesop.

Instead of the earlier omniscient third person point of view Davies selects the first person point of view for the Deptford trilogy. The narrative situation in each novel is confessional and mostly introspective. In A Mixture of Frailties Davies enters into an examination of the problem of knowing what people "have sown" and what the harvest is through the various characters' reactions to Giles Revelstoke's death. In the Deptford trilogy, however, his examination of poetic justice is far more complex and extended. By viewing "the consequences of the snowball with the stone in it" extensively from three different angles Davies captures the subtleties of the problem. In A Mixture of Frailties Sir Benedict Domdaniel agrees with Monica Gall that she has "no right to make a judgement" on Giles Revelstoke's actions, yet adds: "But you must—you absolutely must—make judgement on your own behavior" (MF, p. 364). The Deptford trilogy asserts the necessity for the individual to examine his own behaviour and learn to differentiate between the conscious actions he is responsible for and those beyond his control. The confessional urge which arises at some point in the main characters' life stems from their need to defend themselves against injustice, restore balance, as well as to determine their moral responsibility. The medium—the narrative situation—is an organic part of the message as it relates to both individual responsibility and poetic justice. The characters must apprehend a mysterious, at times terrible, yet truly just, power shaping human existence; in other words, the power Davies depicts thematically and

technically as poetic justice. This power moves the characters towards the wholeness of the 'stone.'

Chapter III

PURITY, WHOLENESS, AND POETIC JUSTICE IN THE DEPTFORD TRILOGY

The relationship between spirit and matter is a progressively central concern in Davies' novels. In the first two Salterton novels, however, the broader central conflict sets the human elements which affirm and enhance life against life-negating elements: tender, loving care as opposed to possessiveness, art as opposed to reason and materialism, and the impulse for independence and inner growth as opposed to suppression of the individual. Humphrey and Molly Cobbler, in particular, embody the life affirming elements; Professor Vambrace and Mrs. Bridgetower the life negating ones. In A Mixture of Frailties, however, Davies links these earlier concerns with the duality of matter and spirit. Monica must learn to accept, love, and forgive her own frailties of body as well as soul before she can grow as an individual and an artist. She must also learn to accept that the individual artist as well as art in general cannot thrive without money. Sir Benedict Domdaniel, Monica's main counselor in art and life, urges her to ignore the common view of chastity: "get this maxim in your head and reflect on it: chastity is having the body in the soul's keeping—just that and nothing more" (MF, p. 242). Ma Gall's inner torment on her deathbed—her fear that she has somehow transgressed against the "morality of sexual prohibition"—confirms Monica's belief in Domdaniel's maxim (MF, pp. 281-2). Hector Macilwraith is, however, a comic counterpart of Ma Gall. On the two

occasions when Macilwraith's ideal of sexual chastity is threatened, by his own "voluptuousness" in the first instance and by what he believes to be Roger Tasset's seduction of Griselda in the second, his body rebels with intestinal rumbles and squeals (TT, pp. 224-8,238). Macilwraith compensates for his suppression of body and soul by eating, whereas Ma Gall's solace is sugar. In the Deptford trilogy, however, Davies examines more closely the problems of a society whose moral or religious ideals reject matter in favour of spirit. Each Deptford novel relates the protagonist's search for values alternative to the ones impressed upon him in childhood. In my study I will, however, examine the Deptford values because in his depiction of Deptford Davies defines more clearly than in any of his other novels how and why rigid, conventional Christian ideals of purity undermine rather than enhance the spiritual development of the individual. The 'stone' represents the alternative values that the characters seek in the Deptford trilogy, and particularly in The Rebel Angels.

Then the 'stone,' the central unifying symbol in the Deptford trilogy puts the concept of justice at the core of the trilogy. Poetic justice moves the individual towards an ideal state of wholeness, equilibrium—a realization of a self in the center of his being which has "[t]he attributes of the stone—incorruptibility, permanence, divinity. . . ." (Jung, CW 13, par. 127). Central in Davies' development of the theme of wholeness is the union of contending opposites: spirit and matter, the unconscious and the conscious. Correspondingly, the 'stone' in the trilogy is, on the one hand, a measurable physical object: "a piece of Canadian pink granite about the size and shape of

a hen's egg."[16] On the other hand, the stone's spiritual significance transcends its objective reality. Like the philosopher's stone, it is "half physical, half metaphysical" (Jung, CW 14, par. 649). Jung states: "Man himself is partly empirical, partly transcendental; he too is a [stone that is no stone]" (CW 14, par. 765). Jung explains:

> For the psychologist [the stone] is the self—man as he is, and the indescribable and superempirical totality of the same man. This totality is a mere postulate, but a necessary one, because no one can assert that he has complete knowledge of man as he is. Not only in the psychic man is there something unknown, but also in the physical. (CW 14, par. 765)

Wholeness is an ideal concept since the unconscious and the body are basically mysterious to man. Padre Blazon, the Jesuit priest who befriends Dunstan Ramsay, is the main spokesman for wholeness, in addition to Liselotte Vitzlipützli. Blazon sees trust in God as man's forgiveness of himself "for being a human creature"—of body as well as spirit. He seeks a God who helps him "to link the wisdom of the body with the wisdom of the spirit until the two are one."[17] Paradoxically, the body decays as the spirit gains wisdom, experience. Seeking a God who helps him resolve this paradox, Blazon anticipates a Christ who "comes again . . . to declare the unity of the life of the flesh and the life of the spirit. And then perhaps we shall make some sense of this life of marvels, cruel circumstances, obscenities, and commonplaces. . . . [W]e might even make it bearable for everybody" (FB, p. 177). However, the Deptford community, which shapes the four principal characters, strives not

towards the ideal of wholeness, but towards the Christian ideal of perfection—purity.

Because Deptford rejects the ideals the 'stone' symbolizes, the implications of Davies' development of the Deptfordian's deliberate struggles towards purity need to be examined. Davies unfolds the Deptford attitude to spirit and matter, the unconscious and the conscious, from three points of view: those of Dunstan Ramsay, David Staunton and Magnus Eisengrim. David's recollections of his childhood summers in Deptford present the formative influence of the Staunton home in Deptford, so he reveals by proxy the values that shaped Boy Staunton, his father. Ramsay, David, and Eisengrim each reveal one aspect of Deptford and each view is shaped by his family background and status within the community. Ramsay says: "our family enjoyed a position of modest privilege, for my father was the owner and editor of the local weekly paper, The Deptford Banner. It was not a very prosperous enterprise, but . . . it sustained us . . . (FB, p. 17). Ramsay continues that "we were, in a sense, the literary leaders of the community. . . . Our household, then was representative of the better sort of life in the village, and we thought well of ourselves" (FB, p. 17). The Stauntons think no less of themselves; they are affluent and Doctor Staunton's profession further elevates the family status. From his summer visits as a boy, David remembers Deptford, the place where his parents were born but could not stand, as "an Arcadia" (M, p. 76). "My upbringing was a good deal dominated by my grandparents at that time" observes David, referring to the Stauntons; the Cruikshanks, his maternal

grandparents, he learns to regard as inferior because they "were poor" (M, p. 85). Eisengrim, however, grew up as Paul Dempster in a family which was not only poor but also scorned by the whole village. Hence Davies presents Deptford through characters from three distinct social levels. Dunstan, who comes from a middle class "intellectual" family, gives the broadest and the most detailed view of Deptford. Due to the status of their respective families within Deptford and restraints caused either by that position or by dominating family members, David Staunton's and Magnus Eisengrim's overview of Deptford is considerably more limited. The recollections of all three are in agreement, however, on Deptford's wariness of the body and obsessive desire to purify spirit by cleansing the body. Ramsay's youth in Deptford is primarily shaped by two strong anima figures whose attitudes to matter and spirit are diametrically opposed: his mother and Mary Dempster. David's youth is shaped by a demonic anima figure, Netty Quelch, who views spirit and matter exactly as does his paternal grandfather, the first of a number of father figures whose views oppose those of his father, Boy Staunton. Eisengrim's youth is shaped by the negative image of his mother impressed upon him by the Deptford children and reinforced by his father, the predominant father figure of his childhood. Ramsay plays a secondary role in Paul's daily life, but a primary one in the direction of his life.

Dunstan Ramsay, or Dunstable as his Christian name was, opens his description of Deptford in Fifth Business by observing how popular concepts of village life have gone from one extreme to another. Ramsay

rejects the image of the "laughable, lovable simpletons, unspotted by the worldiness of city life, though occasionally shrewd in rural concerns," as well as the image of "villages as rotten with vice" although concealed beneath a facade of "rigid piety." Instead he offers a more balanced view of his village:

> It was more varied in what it offered to the observer than people from bigger and more sophisticated places generally think, and if it had sins and follies and roughnesses, it also had much to show of virtue, dignity, and even of nobility. (p. 16)

Ramsay's narration of Deptford life supports this statement. The villagers are quick to respond to those in need without grudging time or effort. Mrs. Ramsay's ingenuity and determination in nurturing premature Paul Dempster, her assistance with the "demented old" Athelstan woman, and her initial willingness to support Mary Dempster and tactfully "'show her the ropes'" of being a practical housewife are examples of the "kind heart" and the "practical help" Deptford "understood best" (pp. 19-24,17,26,58). The villagers' collective willingness to assist in caring for Dunstan's brother Willie while he is seriously ill is a further example of this concern. In a deeply emotional situation, however, such as when Deptford celebrates its heroes' return from the W.W. I battlefield, the suppressed shadow nature of the villagers erupts. Deptford children and adults alike join in a symbolic ritual of human sacrifice, burning an effigy of the Kaiser. Their celebration of their heroes' survival thus turns into demonic revelry and symbolic cruelty (pp. 101-2).

Although quick to respond positively to mental and physical distress, the villagers demand that spirit and body be kept not only healthy and clean—but at all times within strict bonds. They are "too much the descendants of hard-bitten pioneers" for the non-practical "world of wonders" to have any place in their lives (p. 25). They regard miracles as things of a distant past. Thus rather than seeing Willie's recovery, as Ramsay does, as the working of a life-giving spirit through matter, they consider Dunstan in danger of "'brain fever', supposed to attack students" (p. 63). "[W]e understood prettiness and guardedly admitted it as a pleasant, if needless, thing in a woman," says Dunstan (p. 25). He observes, however, "that while our village contained much of what humanity has to show, it did not contain everything, and one of the things it conspicuously lacked was an aesthetic sense" (p. 25). Consequently, Deptford does not value Mrs. Dempster's seemingly frail and girlish attractiveness which more than anything stems from inner illumination: "she had a gentleness of expression and a delicacy of colour that was uncommon" and unappreciated by the community (p. 25). Deptford people are generally immune to the aesthetic quality of spiritual radiance and Mrs. Dempster's readiness to laugh puzzles them; "We were serious people," says Dunstan (pp. 26,18). Deptford inhabitants live according to "the old, fallacious idea that joy and merriment are not religious feelings" (OH, p. 256). Although they claim trust in God they dissociate His power from the human body, distrustful that He would work miraculous wonders amongst them through matter.

The body, particularly its natural functions, are evidently the

Devil's domain in the Deptford mind and thus it must be cleansed and subdued with somber practicality and hard work. Dunstan's references to the problem of keeping "privies" from becoming "disgraceful" suggest that the obsession with cleanliness arose partly from necessity. The stress on purity and perfection rather than wholeness, however, goes beyond the merely physical to the spiritual realm. Willie's "stubborn retention of urine" is "spoken of around the village in hushed tones," indicative of unease with the subject matter (pp. 57,57-8). Similar hesitancy to openly address physical development is evident in the "attitude towards matters of sex" which "was enough to make a hell of adolescence for any boy who was, like myself, deeply serious and mistrustful of whatever seemed pleasurable in life":

> So here I was, subject . . . to the smutty, whispering speculations of the other boys I knew, and tormented by the suspicion that my parents were somehow involved in this hog-wallow of sex that had begun to bulk so large in my thoughts . . . . (pp. 23-24)

Boy Staunton's refusal to accept his guilt for having harmed Mrs. Dempster leads Dunstan to assume sole responsibility for her premature delivery of her son and the concealment of his and Boy's involvement in the accident. The burden of concealed guilt and his ignorance of matters pertaining to sex bring Dunstan to some erroneous conclusions about parenthood:

> . . . I was directly responsible for a grossly sexual act—the birth of a child. . . . In the hot craziness of my thinking,

> I began to believe that I was more responsible for the birth of Paul Dempster than were his parents, and that if this were ever discovered some dreadful fate would overtake me. Part of the dreadful fate would undoubtedly be rejection by my mother. (p. 24)

Puberty, difficult enough in itself, is further complicated by Dunstan's complex feeling of guilt and his fear that his mother will reject him for having actually fathered Paul. Dunstan believes, in fact, that he has been instrumental in an immaculate conception which resulted in "a grossly sexual act—the birth of a child" who at first looks like the Devil's spawn.

Davies again exhibits the Deptford association between the Devil and the body in a conversation Dunstan overhears between his parents, and in the villagers' reaction to Mary Dempster's nonconformist attitude to the body. When Dunstan listens in on one of his parents' discussions of the repercussions of the snowball Boy intended for him, his mother comments that whoever threw the snowball, "the Devil guided his hand" (p. 25). Dunstan immediately adds to himself: "Yes, and the Devil shifted his mark" (p. 25). He adds to his already heavy burden guilt for having deprived Mrs. Dempster of her sanity. Mrs. Dempster is in most aspects the exact opposite to an ordinary Deptfordian. Largely on account of her failure to fit the norm, she is deemed simple and her whole family is ostracized by all but the Ramsays. Even Mrs. Ramsay's compassion which "never wavered" comes to an end, however, when Mrs. Dempster is caught in a sexual act with a tramp in the gravel pit outside of Deptford (p. 28). Then

Mrs. Dempster "transgressed in a realm where there could be no shades of right and wrong," particularly in the eyes of the Deptford ladies (p. 49). Rather than having "been raped, as a decent woman would have been," Mrs. Dempster willingly "yielded because a man wanted her . . . so badly" and "was very civil" (pp. 49,48). Dunstan observes:

> The subject was not one that could be freely discussed even among intimates, but it was understood without saying that if women began to yield for such reasons as that, marriage and society would not last long. Any man who spoke for Mary Dempster probably believed in Free Love. Certainly he associated sex with pleasure, and that put him in a class with filthy thinkers like Cece Athelstan. (p. 50)

Already suspect for her unconcealed physical bloom and enjoyment of her pregnancy as well as her delight in nursing Paul, Mary Dempster becomes a woman possessed by the Devil in the Deptford mind when she admits without shame that she does not find sexuality repulsive.

In the everlasting conflict between spirit and matter, the conscious and the unconscious, Mrs. Ramsay represents Deptford's alignment. Mrs. Ramsay is an upright, respected member of the community, whereas Mrs. Dempster is the outcast. The former may be seen as representative of Deptford morality and the latter as representative of the qualities the community rejects and suppresses. Ramsay describes his mother as "a woman of good sense and kindness of heart," hard working and "clean—oh, but she was clean!" (pp. 19,18). Mrs. Dempster also has a kind heart but her generosity lacks tempering practicality. She also lacks the incentive or capacity to keep her

household clean and thrifty. Both Mrs. Ramsay and Mrs. Dempster demonstrate the capacity, peculiar to the anima or the soul, to animate matter: "it would not rouse itself without this incentive, for the inertia of matter is inborn in it . . ." (Jung, CW, par. 673). Dunstan's mother becomes a second mother to Paul Dempster when her "lionlike spirit" joins Paul's "fighter" spirit in a battle for his life; she is "the acknowledged high priestess" without whom Dr. Causland admits that "he could never have pulled little Paul safely up to the shores of this world" (pp. 22,21,19). Poetic justice is served when Mary Dempster brings Mrs. Ramsay's son, Willie, back to life. When Paul gains strength enough to retain "a perceptible part" of the milk Mrs. Ramsay feeds him from a fountain pen, however, Ramsay notes that his "father was even more pleased than [his] mother" (FB, p. 22). When Willie gains consciousness, on the other hand, Mrs. Dempster is "deeply pleased but . . . [seemingly not] particularly surprised by what happened" (p. 60). Mrs. Ramsay's and Mrs. Dempster's opposing reactions to having been instrumental in a human being's miraculous survival reflect their fundamental difference; also, the one is granted public credit for her efforts—the other is further discredited by the community.

Mrs. Ramsay has a strong sense of propriety. She firmly suppresses her sexuality. Non-rational mental activity she does not like. Ramsay recalls that his "mother who had strong features and stood no nonsense from her hair, said that Mrs. Dempster had a face like a pan of milk" (p. 25). Dunstan's mother cannot appreciate or condone sexual vitality or beauty which stems from spiritual freedom and

vitality. She does, however, enjoy "the authority of nursing and the mystery which at that time still hung about the peculiarly feminine functions" (p. 19). Humour, on the other hand, she does not enjoy. When Mrs. Ramsay calls upon her son to explain the egg he broke in an attempt to make his "red, knuckly Scots hands" work the wonders of magic, Ramsay is "[v]isited unhappily by a good one" (p. 35). Davies refers to classifications of women "identified by one of the foremost female psychologists of our time, Irene Clarement de Castillejo" in The Mirror of Nature, one of which is that of "the Amazon, and her shadow aspect is the Termagant or Brawling Woman" (p. 47). Mrs. Ramsay does indeed show her son the Termagant side of her Amazon nature in response to his "good one." She pursues him "around the kitchen, slashing [him] with the whip until she [breaks him] down and [he cries]" (p. 36). Ramsay is the one, however, who has to beg forgiveness of his mother:

> This I had to do on my knees, repeating a formula improvised by my father, which included a pledge that I would always love my mother to whom I owed the great gift of life, and that I begged her—and secondarily God—to forgive me, knowing full well that I was unworthy of such clemency. (p. 36)

Hence the broken egg becomes the philosopher's egg to Ramsay—affording him an unforgettable glimpse into the ancient world of the unconscious "that showed very little of itself on the surface" (p. 36).

Mrs. Dempster, on the other hand, is oblivious to Deptford propriety and her unconscious surfaces with increasing power each time she encounters rejection or suppression:

> When she was pregnant there was a bloom about her that seemed out of keeping with the seriousness of her state; it was not at all the proper thing for a pregnant woman to smile so much, and the least she could have done was to take a stronger line with those waving tendrils of hair that seemed so often to be escaping from a properly severe arrangement. . . . [S]he lacked the solemnity [the Deptford women] expected of a nursing mother; she enjoyed the process, and sometimes when they went into the house there she was with everything showing, even though her husband was present, just as if she hadn't the sense to pull up her clothes. (p. 26)

Mrs. Dempster's abandoned and unselfconscious delight in her femininity is beyond Deptford's ken so they regard her as an unacceptable simpleton. When she transgresses the final limits of Deptford's moral tolerance, the villagers come to regard her as dangerous and her husband restrains her by tying her up (p. 53). Thus Mrs. Dempster becomes representative of the unknown, the unlived life of physical and spiritual freedom which Deptford fears and keeps firmly fettered.

The Deptfordians project their feminine shadow aspects upon Mrs. Dempster. In addition to the Amazon/Termagant, Davies' summary of de Castillejo's classification of female archetypes includes the following:

> . . . the mate and Mother, and her opposite, the Witch or Destructive Woman. Another is the Hetaera or Companion, whose negative aspect is the Harlot. . . . [The] rarest is the

> Medium, the woman in touch, it seems, with things not normally accessible, and her negative aspect is the Madwoman, always more terrifying to men than to her own sex. (MN, p. 47)

In Deptford, Mary Dempster is a Witch, a Harlot, a Madwoman, from whom no one is safe: "It was widely accepted that, even if she could not help it, she was in the grip of unappeasable and indiscriminate desire" (p. 62). In Mrs. Dempster's relation to Deptford Davies demonstrates the interrelatedness of the individual and society, the conscious and the unconscious, good and evil. The less the Deptfordians see and know Mrs. Dempster, the more they fear her spell and reject her. In direct proportion to the community's, and her husband's, rejection of her, the deeper she is absorbed into the unconscious, eventually getting totally lost in an unconscious realm of terror when Dunstan confronts her with her own son's rejection of his mother (p. 232). Ironically, the characteristics which the Deptfordians fear and reject as evil in Mrs. Dempster are the founding ideals of Christianity: absolute trust in God and unconditional and indiscriminate charity for one's fellow man, irrespective of his worldly status and with no expectations of personal gain. She is in fact the rejected cornerstone upon which the faith was built—the philosopher's stone in Davies' theology.

Young Dunstable Ramsay differs from other Deptfordians by recognizing Mrs. Dempster's redemptive qualities—the Mother/Mate, the Hetaera, the Medium—as well as her shadow sides. Before she completely loses touch with time and place, aspects of the conscious, and regresses into the demonic side of the unconscious, Ramsay sees in Mrs. Dempster "a

breadth of outlook and a clarity of vision that were strange and wonderful" (p. 52). Ramsay further describes Mrs. Dempster as "wholly religious. . . . [S]he . . . seemed to live in a world of trust that had nothing of the stricken, unreal quality of religion about it" (p. 52). She trusts in a process identical to that of the philosopher's stone which "begins with evil and ends with good" (Jung, CW 13, par. 276).

> . . . I recognize now that it was her lack of fear, of apprehension, of assumption that whatever happened was inevitably going to lead to some worse state of affairs, that astonished and enriched me. . . . She lived by a light that arose from within. . . . (p. 52)

The Deptfordians, on the other hand, fear the darkness which arises from within and which they associate with the body. In their fear of the unknown they lose the very capacity they exalt—rationality; their projection of what they fear within themselves, unto a person like Mrs. Dempster or a symbolic figure like the Kaiser, is disproportionate to the cause of the fear and indeed leads them towards their greatest fear—the demonic. Dunstan realizes that Mrs. Dempster's ready laughter often stems from an insight into this paradox; when she "seemed to be laughing at things her husband took very seriously, she had been laughing at the disproportion of the seriousness" (p. 52). Mrs. Dempster's laugh, which Deptford dismissed as the uncomprehending gigglings of a fool," anticipates her son's sardonic Merlin's laugh; the laughter of mother and son arises from their capacity to see beyond the moment, to perceive the poetic justice

which overrules human folly and pettiness, to see the jewel in the dung-heap. In spite of his insight Ramsay suffers from the ethical rigidity of his upbringing and the "callously romantic cast of [his] mind" (p. 53). He cannot reconcile Mrs. Dempster's wholly religious side with her unconventional attitude to the body and decides "that this unknown aspect must be called madness" (p. 53).

Once Mrs. Ramsay becomes aware that Mrs. Dempster poses a threat to her supreme goddess position as a Mother/Mate in her son's inner life she confronts him with an ultimatum—to choose between them. "I made a third choice," says Ramsay, to go off to the war in Europe, concealing that he is underage (p. 64). The conflict between the two animas within Ramsay remains unresolved until he meets Liselotte Vitzlipützli. In contrast to Mrs. Dempster's unconditional charity, Mrs. Ramsay wants to do good, be good, and she is possessive more than she is loving. Although fully aware of her "disgrace with the world," Mrs. Dempster feels neither disgrace, humiliation, nor resentment for her enforced exile (pp. 52-3). Her wholly religious attitude, "somewhat akin to the splendour [Ramsay] found in books" stands in sharp contrast to Mrs. Ramsay's assumption of supreme divinity so that God is of secondary importance (pp. 52-3). Mrs. Dempster revels in the physical and the emotional side of being a mother but shows no regard for the Deptford standards of cleanliness. Mrs. Ramsay, however, has no regard for physical or emotional delights and before she totally rejects Mrs. Dempster she shows her concern for little Paul Dempster by worming him occasionally. Her obsession with cleanliness and attraction to midwifery suggest, however, that although her ideal

may be spiritual elevation through purification of matter, she is indeed drawn to the realm of the body. Furthermore, in the Ramsay household her authority is superior to God's. But the anima aspect that Mrs. Ramsay, like other Deptfordians, rejects and suppresses within herself is necessary to the wholeness of being. Davies observes in The Mirror of Nature that ". . . Lady Soul is not a religious concept. She is desirable and she may be attained . . . because she [is] a courtesan, an hetaera. . . ." (p. 78). The anima or the soul, according to Jung, is a mediator between spirit and matter; "Since the soul animates the body, just as the soul is animated by the spirit, she tends to favour the body and everything bodily, sensuous, and emotional" (CW 14, par. 673). The Deptfordians' efforts to sever the soul from the body ultimately thwart their intentions: their soul is alienated from the spirit—fettered by the body. They direct their will and energy towards chastising and purifying the body. Ramsay refrains from confronting the conflict between the values he finds in Mrs. Dempster and the values of Deptford by avoiding deep involvement with the opposite sex, the same way he avoided the fatal snowball and a choice between his mother and Mrs. Dempster.

The Deptford desire to purify spirit by purifying matter dominates David Staunton's recollections in The Manticore. David's grandfather and Netty Quelch, David's nurse, substitute mother, and eventually housekeeper, embody Deptford morality in David's life. Netty keeps a close watch on David at all times, vigilantly trying to keep him clean:

> Netty stood between me and everyone else. I didn't play with the other boys in the village because they weren't clean. Probably they did not wash often enough under their foreskins. Netty was stong on that. (p. 88)

Insistent that "If you're not clean under there, you're not clean anyplace," Netty herself takes care of David's ablutions: "you let yourself get dirty under there, and you'll get an awful disease" (p. 88). Not only does Netty hint that insufficient cleanliness causes venereal disease, but she assures David that Cece Athelstan's syphilis symptoms are the result "of unchecked spitting" (p. 88). Furthermore, when David's and his sister Caroline's budding sexuality comes to Netty's attention she cautions them on the spiritual dangers of sexual indulgence by offering them the example of Mrs. Dempster who "had gone stark, staring mad" from having "always been 'at it'" (p. 147). Netty is the main advocate for Deptford morality in the city; David's grandparents, particularly his grandfather, however, are the main spokespersons for purity during his childhood visits to Deptford. David's recollections of his visits with his grandparents reveal the attitudes and values which shaped his father when growing up.

David explains that "Netty held [Doc Staunton] in great awe because he was rich, and a doctor, and looked on life as a serious, desperate struggle" (p. 78). However, Doc Staunton's most impassioned struggle as a doctor was "against constipation, and he kept up the campaign at home" (p. 80), making Netty his disciple in "the craft of dealing with constipation" (p. 80). Their struggle to consciously

control, suppress, and purify the nether regions of the body has strong religious overtones. Netty and Doc Staunton regard David's bowels as the battlefield of good and evil, where evil poisons must be rounded up and driven forth: "On Sunday morning, therefore, I was ready for church as pure as the man from whom Paul drove forth the evil spirits" (p. 80). David observes that when in the United Church in Deptford "if Jesus turned up I sang the name very low, and in the secret voice I used when talking to my grandmother about what my bowels were doing" (p. 83). This parallel emphasizes that the Stauntons' attitude to the dark nether regions of the body is coloured by both emnity and by the awe appropriate to the adversary who there resides. David's low, reverent voice for discussing his bowels parallels the Deptfordians' hushed tones for discussing Willie's retention of urine in Fifth Business. In The Manticore, however, Davies emphasizes with greater clarity the nature of the shadow side in Deptford's antagonism, tinged with awe, toward the body.

Dunstan reports a single incident when the shadow side of his mother's nature erupted unconcealed and, therefore, had to be acknowledged, if not accepted; David, however, records such recognition only in retrospect. The strain of cruelty Mrs. Ramsay reveals when she flogs Dunstan shows in Netty's and Doc Staunton's measures to ensure David's physical purity. Netty's soap-wash under David's foreskin pains and humiliates him. Even more does his grandfather's solution to the apparent problem which arises when David becomes "habituated to [the] terrible weekly aids [for constipation], and nothing happened in between": Doc Staunton's 'improved' version of "Dr. Tyrrell's

Domestic Internal Bath" (p. 80). Doc Staunton's glee over another "medical" procedure further illustrates Deptford's cruel efforts to control the body. When people were so badly affected with rheumatism that they could not move and could not be helped "'in the old days, they'd hold this thing here right tight up against where he was stiff, and then they'd press this button—'" Doc explains to David (p. 79).

> Here he pressed the button, and from the surface of the metal plate leapt twelve tiny knife-points, perhaps an eighth of an inch long.
>
> "Then he's budge," said Grandfather, and laughed. (pp. 79-80)

Like the constipation cures, the scarifier overrules voluntary physical functions.

David identifies the impulse behind the obsession with purity when he explains his earlier failure to recognize the dark side of authority:

> But I seem to have been born with an unusual regard for authority and the power of reason, and I was too small to know how readily these qualities can be brought to the service of the wildest nonsense and cruelty. (p. 81)

By the principle of enantiodromia, the Deptford desire for Christian purity and control of animal insticts runs into its opposite: leads to unnatural practices and savage cruelty. In The Rebel Angels, a conversation during a Guest Night at the College of St. John and the Holy Ghost further explains the Deptfordians' unacknowledged motives

for interfering with their children's defecation. A professor remarks that "Civilization rests on two things, . . . the discovery that fermentation produces alcohol, and voluntary ability to inhibit defecation."[18] Another professor elaborates:

> . . . inhibition of defectation is in essence a theological matter, and unquestionably one of the effects of the Fall of Man. And that, as everybody now recognizes, means the dawn of personal consciousness, the separation of the individual from the tribe, or mass. Animals have no such power of inhibition. . . . Animals know themselves but dimly. . . . When man ate the fruit from the Tree of Knowledge he became aware of himself as something other than a portion of his surroundings, and he dropped his last, carefree turd, as he, with wandering steps and slow, from Eden took his solitary way. (p. 177)

Thus Mrs. Ramsay's occasional worming of Paul Dempster as well as Netty's and the older Staunton's total control of David's bowel movements directly interfere with the "voluntary ability to inhibit defecation" which distinguishes man from animals. In a broader context this interference underlines the onesidedness of the pursuit for purity. Most importantly, however, the pursuit of purity hinders individuation because its cruelty and obsession with power remain unconscious—unacknowledged. In the symbolic sacrifice of the Kaiser and the less direct sacrifice of Mrs. Dempster, the sinister elements of Deptford's unconscious reinforce the bonds within "the tribe, or mass" more than they serve individuation.

Davies establishes an interesting ground for comparison and contrast between David Staunton and Paul Dempster within the Deptford

community. David is treated "as the young princeling of Deptford," whereas Paul is an outcast (M, p. 88). However, their inner development runs parallel in significant respects. The Staunton family wealth affects David's inner development, much as Paul's mother's reputation in Deptford affects his inner development. Netty's condescending disapproval of David's mother and her family's lack of money encourages him to adopt the view that his mother is a burden to his father, and unnecessary to himself. Paul is also estranged from his mother, only in a much more serious manner. Recalling his life as Paul Dempster, Magnus Eisengrim says that he might have loved his mother if he "'had ever known her'"; "'But, you see, the person I knew was a woman unlike anybody else's mother, who was called "hoor" by people like . . . [Boy] Staunton'" (FB, p. 260). As Dunstan reports, Paul grows up with a father who frequently prays aloud "[a]nd never finished without asking God for strength to bear his heavy cross, by which I knew that he meant Mrs. Dempster; she knew it too" (FB, p. 40). Paul himself only knows:

> My mother had done something—I never found out what it was—that made most of the village hate her, and the children knew that, so it was all right to hate me and torture me. . . . [T]hey tormented me with a virtuosity they never showed in anything else they did. . . . I only knew that there was something filthy and disgraceful that pertained to my mother, and that we all, my father and I, were spattered by her shame, or abomination, or whatever it might be.[19]

Thus both David and Paul have onesided images of their mothers—

images shaped by other people, based on concerns with matter: money in one case, the body in the other.

Furthermore, David and Paul are isolated: David by Netty and her obsession with physical purity and the Staunton wealth—Paul by "a primal evil, a pure malignance" released in the Deptford children by his mother's reputation (WW, p. 24). The Staunton wealth deprives David of companionship or sympathy. The Deptford conviction that Paul's mother is a "hoor," dangerous because of her spellbinding, insatiable physical desire, deprives Paul of companionship with other Deptford children. Even apparent signs of sympathy for Paul's tears contain barbs of unconscious cruelty, for example when "'somebody might say, "Aw, let the kid alone; he can't help it his mother's a hoor"'" (WW, p. 24). This isolation and the families' habit of secrecy cause David and Paul to grow up uncommonly ignorant about sexuality. David says: "As I look back now I see that, although I knew a good deal about sex, I had retained an unusual innocence for my age. . . ." (M, p. 128). Despite being continually called a hoor's son by the Deptford children and being "brought up so near the country," Paul's ignorance of sex is similar to David's: "It had touched me, but not intimately" (WW, p. 33). Looking back on his ignorance about sex Eisengrim recognizes that the stigma attached to his mother operated like the stigma of wealth: ". . . I suppose only children brought up in wealthy families that desire and can contrive a conspiracy of ignorance—are unknowing about sex" (WW, p. 33). The Deptford children excluded and tormented Paul "from the earliest days [he could] remember, yet Paul did not grow "to

hate them [until] later in life"; he saw himself as "a misfit in the world and didn't know why" (WW, p. 25). Critical understanding of their suffering and humiliation does not occur to Paul or David until later.

Isolation not only bars David and Paul from comprehensive knowledge about themselves, their maternal inheritance, other children, and human sexuality, but also intensifies the moral impact of their guardians. However, David and Paul encounter strongly contrasting values in their childhodd. David's moral values are shaped by Netty whose morals are grounded in the Deptford faith in the redemptive powers of physical purity, toil, and sorrow, on the one hand, and on inveterate respect for money and status on the other. David's father is the other determinant of his values in his youth from what seems to David a divine distance. Paul's primary influence is his father and religion is the center of Amasa Dempster's life. When he has to resign his position as a Baptist parson, "the work dearest to his heart," the "fire" leaves "his eyes" (FB, p. 51). Dunstan hints that Dempster took considerable pride "in the meek spirit in which he bore his ill luck" to marry someone who was a "heavy cross" before the scandal; "But it was the comedown, the disgrace that broke Dempster . . . [N]ow he was nothing in his own eyes, and he clearly feared the worst for his wife" (FB, pp. 41, 40,51). However, Dempster retains his faith in a God who demands physical purity and sobriety, and believes with a passion unfamiliar to Deptford—"a fervor that seemed indecent" (FB, p. 40). Dunstan is the only person who penetrates Paul's isolation and offers him

alternative values.

Within the Staunton family, however, matter or the external manifestations of religion replace spiritual values; the rituals themselves are more important than the spirit. The battle with David's innards is an ironic example of projection of inner reality unto matter. Except for the undertone of cruelty, it is like a variation of the Olympian gods' parody of the human battles. Indeed, David observes:

> Church matters—I won't call it religion—played a big part in my growing up; . . . I was put in the way of thinking a lot about God, and wondering what God thought about me. As with the Prince of Wales, I suspected that he thought rather well of me. (M, pp. 128,82-3)

David links God and his father's idol and he regards both with a blend of complacency and fantasy. Doc Staunton reputedly needs no God, but in David's mind his own father was the reality of a living god. David endows his father with a confusion of Christian and pagan divine attributes. Consequently, David wonders at Netty's insistence that he thank God for his good fortune "when it was so obviously [his] father who was the giver of all good things" (M, p. 74). David's reaction to his father's death at the age of seventy suggests that he attributed immortality to his father, in addition to the attributes of absolute wisdom and love; like God's, his father's ways are mysterious, paradoxical, and beyond reproach (M, pp. 14,73). Like a pagan god, a combination of Zeus and Dionysus, Boy Staunton's "deepest ambition was . . . to leave nothing undone that came within

the range of his desires": "His lamp was always blazing and his loins were girded as tight as they could be" (M, p. 99). Netty insists that David "be a little soldier" but his father demands of him "Manhood," virility (M, pp. 12,73). David's comments reveal that his father was his point of reference—the one to whom he felt accountable; when Boy Staunton died David's "last hope of regaining the trust and approval of his late father had been crushed" (M, p. 62). Thus like his father, David has a living idol by whom he measures himself, but no faith in a transcendental power to which he feels accountable.

Paul's father, however, impresses upon his son belief in a Christian God and Christian distinctions between good and evil. The different values instilled in David and Paul shape their attitudes to masturbation. David "did [his] best to control it because . . . well, it seemed such a shabby thing" (M, p. 128). Paul is raised to a similar distaste of his body but on entirely different grounds:

> What I had, as a male, I had most strictly been warned against as an evil and shameful part of my body. "Don't you ever monkey with yourself, down there," was the full extent of the sexual instruction I had from my father. (WW, p. 33)

Distaste for physical impurity is David's deterrent, whereas Paul is detered by the sinfulness, the evil, the shame of the impure act. Amasa Dempster's main fear is that his son will follow in his mother's footsteps; the Bible, discipline, and corporal punishment are his weapons against that fate: ". . . I was to get the whole of the Book of Psalms by heart. He assured me that it would be a bulwark and a stay to me through the whole of my life" (WW, p. 23). Just as Dunstan comes

to see that his parents "had done the best they could in the lives fate had given them," Eisengrim sees good intentions and parental love behind his father's harsh, uncompromising child-raising methods: "My father loved me, but his love was a greater burden, almost, than hate might have been" (WW, p. 34).

Dempster trusts purity of mind and religious indoctrination to be his son's "bulwark" against evil; the passion of his faith does indeed leave a lasting impression on Paul but his enforced ignorance about sexuality is the alley through which evil enters. Dempster, like other Deptfordians, believes that the flesh must be forced to purity. Rather than explain or inform, he literally harnesses his wife's unruly flesh and beats his son, laying "the rod on hard," after reading a prayer and a Bible quotation which he interprets as a command to fathers to express their love for their sons by beating them (WW, p. 47). Mary Dempster's insight into the sad folly of this cruelty shows in her tears and sometimes sad laughter but she is incapable of intervention—her insight also remains unexpressed. Dempster does explain passages in the Bible which are difficult for his son to understand but the "special tone of shame and detestation when he read about Lot and his daughters" remains unexplained and Paul completely misunderstands the nature of their sin (WW, pp. 135,33). Eisengrim recounts:

> . . . [h]oors . . . were always turning up in the Bible, and always in a bad sense which meant nothing to me as a reality. Ezekiel, sixteen, was a riot of whoredoms and abominations, and I shivered to think how terrible they must be: but I did

> not know what they were, even in the plainest sense of the words. (WW, p. 33)

Eisengrim blames himself for having "cosied up to Willard," for having "smiled up into his face" when "Willard . . . slipped his hand down the back of [ten year old Paul's] pants and gently stroked [his] left buttock. Gave it a meaning squeeze" (WW, pp. 39-40). Looking back Eisengrim says:

> I had never had any knowledge of sex, had never known a sexual caress before, even of the kind parents quite innocently give their children. But at this first sexual approach I yielded. . . . How could I, without any true understanding of what I was doing, respond in such a way to such a strange act? (WW, p. 40)

The answer lies for the most part in the question: Paul is a child starved for gentle affection and so ignorant about sex that he either fails or does not want to distinguish between a friendly demonstration of care and a sexual approach. Also, the person who first introduced Paul to magic, Dunstan Ramsay, was kind to him "and kindness was a great rarity in [Paul's] life" (WW, p. 34). Naturally he expects the same from Willard.

Between them, Dunstan and Paul's father shape Paul's attitude to matter and spirit. Through Dunstan's fumbling experiments as a conjurer, an illusionist, Paul learns that, despite his father's horror of the body, it has magical powers—that his physical dexterity gives rise to some awe and even envy. Paul's discovery of his own special powers draws him like a magnet to the Wanless World of Wonders and Willard:

"I was eager to claim some kinship with this god" (WW, p. 31). Although "shows of all kinds were utterly evil in [his father's] sight," Paul steals enough money at home to see the show on his own and experiences a sense of "delicious release" from restraint (WW, pp. 26,25). After Willard rapes him, however, Paul is incapable of facing his father's certain rage at his son's sinfulness. Yet the two main things that keep Paul alive and sane during his seven years in "hell," under the name Cass Fletcher, are his driving desire to expand his magical powers discovered with Dunstan and the faith in God his father instilled in him:

> Such was the power of my early training that I never became cynical about the Lord—only about his creation. Sometimes I thought he was punishing me for—for just about everything that had ever happened to me, beginning with my birth; sometimes I thought he had forgotten me, but that thought was blasphemy, and I chased it away as fast as I could. (WW, pp. 102-4,111)

The values that Paul learns in Deptford are both exceptions rather than the norm. Dempster's uninhibited passion for religion is exceptional within the Deptford community. Also, Dunstan was "the only person in [Paul's] childhood who . . . treated [him] as if [he] were a human creature" (WW, p. 34). "You never ran with the crowd" says Eisengrim to Dunstan (WW, p. 34). Thus from Dunstan's example Eisengrim learns another lesson contrary to the general Deptford attitude—one which points the way towards individuation rather than reinforcing the bonds of the "tribe."

In his depiction of Deptford, Davies demonstrates the problems that arise from unquestioning acceptance of a superficial Christianity as an ideology rather than faith. Jung offers an explanation applicable to the Deptford dilemma:

> You can . . . forcibly apply the ideals you regard as right with an effort of will, and can do so for a certain length of time and up to a certain point, that is, until signs of fatigue appear and the original enthusiasm wanes. Then free will becomes a cramp of the will, and the life that has been suppressed forces its way into the open through all the cracks. That, unfortunately, is the lot of all merely rational resolutions. . . . [W]hat counts in religious experience is not how explicitly an archetype can be formulated but how much I am gripped by it. (CW 14, pars. 742,745)

The only religious enthusiast in Deptford is Amasa Dempster whose passion seems indecent to his setting. Dempster's fervor leaves, however, a more lasting impression on his son than the sedate rationality of the other parents or parent substitutes. Dempster is not content as his wife is with religious experience alone. He formulates a moral construct which he calls God and turns that construct into a whipping post for his whole family. Dempster commits exactly the same error as the other Deptford families: he enforces his ideals upon himself and upon others, thus suppressing the life-affirming ideals upon which Christianity is based.

Deptford's Christian ideology negates the cornerstone of the faith. Deptford frowns upon open demonstration of love, joy, and mirth

with "her" "loose" "tresses" and "zone unbound" (MN, p. 85). Mrs. Dempster embodies all of these as well as the highest ideals of Christianity: trust in God and love of God, herself, and her 'neighbour.' She lacks prudence, however. Mrs. Dempster is Deptford's rejected cornerstone, its soul in fetters—the philosopher's stone; she symbolizes all that Deptford fears, yet her own lack of fear of the body terrifies the villagers most of all. They forget that Christ cautioned when an adultress was about to be stoned to death for her sins that whoever was without sin should throw the first stone and no stone was thrown, either by Christ or others. The Deptfordians are afraid to examine the foundation of their ideals and have little tolerance for deviations from the straight and narrow path to salvation. In their frantic effort to raise their children to a higher state of being, the Deptfordians themselves regress to a state of brutality and reduce the children to the level of animals to be beaten to obedience or things to be prodded, disinfected, and emptied of impurities. In addition to the physical suppression, Deptfordians believe that ignorance and physical labour are means of maintaining group control. They fear that immoderate studies as well as sexual indulgence will cause mental illness such as that of "Elbert Hubbard [who] was a notoriously queer American who thought that work could be a pleasure" (FB, p. 63). Dunstable Ramsay, Percy Boyd Staunton, and Paul Dempster have to leave Deptford because each rejects his dominant parent's taboos, which are also the taboos of the community. All three pattern their lives in opposition to their dominant parents' ideals and David, in turn, reacts against his father's.

The Deptfordians reap what they sow. Attempting to possess their sons, they lose them. By imposing the will on the unconscious and the body, they themselves fall victims to what they most fear and seek to conquer. Once the libido is suppressed, the spirit rejected, the unappeased soul seeks other channels: Mrs. Ramsay is a devouring Mother/Mate; Netty burns within with alarming, "boundless overheated energy"; Doc and Mrs. Staunton are obese from compensating with food; Amasa Dempster finds an outlet in beating his son; and David turns to drink (FB, p. 81; M, pp. 77,76,78). Jung notes that "for the alchemists matter had a divine aspect," and that they saw the process of the philosopher's stone as the redemption of God through matter (CW 14, par. 766; 12, par. 420). He points out, however, that most of them were unaware that they were projecting their inner life upon matter, the philosopher's stone. Discussing Gerard Dorn as conscious of his projection of the self upon the "caelum, which corresponds to the stone," Jung observes that Dorn

> . . . nevertheless believed in the possibility of a onesided spiritualization, without considering that the precondition for this is a materialization of the spirit. . . . In reality his labours elevated the body into proximity with the spirit while at the same time drawing the spirit down into matter. By sublimating matter he concretized spirit. (CW 14, par. 765, 764)

The Deptfordians resemble the alchemist in being unaware of their projections in their attempts to sublimate matter, yet unlike the alchemist they view the body with hostility.

By rejecting the values that Mrs. Dempster embodies they forfeit

the philosopher's stone which unites matter and spirit, the conscious and the unconscious. They offer their children a God of their own making. Their children, accountable to no one above man and vulnerable in their ignorance of themselves as human beings, either take super-human responsibility for their own actions or reject it altogether. Ramsay's assumption of sole responsibility for Mrs. Dempster's insanity and Paul's birth, as well as Eisengrim's assumption of sole responsibility for Willard raping him, are examples of the former. Sometimes they act on insufficient information: Ramsay was unaware of the stone in the snowball Percy Staunton meant for him and Paul Dempster was ignorant of the sexual implications of Willard's caress. Both as the boy Percy and as an adult, Boy rejects responsibility for his conscious choice to harm another human being. The "stone that is no stone" teaches acceptance of a power to which the individual is responsible for a conscious choice of action, yet it also demands trust in the prevailing benevolence of that power which may work through darkness as well as light. Eisengrim calls it "the Great Justice"—Liesl calls it "Poetic Justice" (WW, p. 313). Poetic justice in the Deptford trilogy is the organizing principle which largely determines man's fate: Davies suggests that man is predestined to inner wholeness and that rejection of or battle against that fate is futile at best—yet more likely to be destructive.

The relationship between spirit and matter, the unconscious and the conscious is also a principal theme in The Rebel Angels, in which Davies focuses his thematic development on the mystical marriage of opposites. Consequently, this novel emphasizes the concept of

wholeness, which will be discussed in the following chapter. The central world of the novel, the academic world of the College of St. John and the Holy Ghost, is basically antithetical to Deptford where cleanliness and ignorance of body are considered marks of virtue. "[C]leanish . . . is the most a scholar will tolerate," says Parlabane to Maria Magdalena Theotoky; "Too much cleanliness is an enemy to creation, to speculative thought" (p. 11). Arthur Cornish quotes his late uncle and rich patron of the arts, Francis Cornish, on the cause for the "present state" of such ruins as the Acropolis, the pyramids, and Stonehenge: "'Fools say it was invading armies, or the erosion of Time. Rubbish! It was cleaning-women.' He said they always used dusters with hard buttons on them for flogging and flailing at anything with a delicate surface" (p. 23). Not a scholar but a Wise Old Woman, Maria Theotoky's Gypsy mother returns "to Gypsy notions of cleanliness" when her gadjo husband dies. She considers underpants dirty, wears a shift she gives "a good tubbing every few months," and she anoints her body "with olive oil and put[s] a heavier, scented oil on her hair" (p. 128). Her ablutions sound Biblical but reflect the respect for the human body Jung finds missing in Christian thought. The scholars in The Rebel Angels consciously pursue valuable knowledge of spirit and matter from the collective unconscious as well as conscious, from whatever source likely to yield information—more often than not in the refuse. Ozias Froats is one of the "latter day alchemist[s]" who recognize "what is of worth in that which is scorned by the unseeing" (pp. 157,82). He is a scientist doing research on human faeces,

hoping to uncover some of the mysteries of the human body. Thus the characters in The Rebel Angels consciously rebel against and ridicule cleanliness as indicative of inner purity or steadfastly seek answers in the refuse, in pursuing the philosopher's stone. The exception is Urquhart McVarish who seeks the dungheap itself—turning his face away from redeeming physical and spiritual values.

Davies' exploration of spirit, mind, and matter shifts perspective between The Rebel Angels and the earlier novels. His focal point in the Deptford trilogy is the need for a harmonious relationship between spirit and matter, the unconscious and the conscious—a theme initiated in A Mixture of Frailties. The Deptfordians have a low level of consciousness about themselves and thus emerge as victims of their ignorance rather than truly demonic. Their unquestioning attempts to frame God within man-made constructs leave them easy preys to the malevolent side of matter and spirit alike. The Deptford sons who leave home must break from that pattern. Davies' choice of the academic world as the background for The Rebel Angels, however, gives him a broader and more convincing scope for exploring evil. By creating educated characters who seek self-knowledge, Davies directly examines manifestations of an organizing principle which shapes the destiny of both spirit and body. The Rebel Angels thus emphasizes the affinity between matter and spirit, the conscious and the unconscious—their parallel characteristics; and reasserts that their mystical marriage is predestined, as will be discussed in the following chapter.

Chapter IV

THE 'STONE': SYMBOL AND FORM IN THE DEPTFORD TRILOGY

In all of Davies' novels poetic justice is an organizing principle that shapes human fate, at times overruling a character's will as it presses him to move to greater wholeness. His interest in the concept of wholeness—the union of man's physical and metaphysical nature, the rational and the non-rational—appears in his earliest fiction. The "Fated Man" Ramsay refers to in World of Wonders is a recurrent character in Davies' novels (p. 87). Davies signals the fate in store for each character through allusions to drama, myth, folklore, and romance. Rational, chaste, Hector Macilwraith is fated to go through emotional and physical tempest, and eventually symbolic death of the old self, in comparison to the real death of the Greek Hector, before reaching the calm shores of clearer insight into himself and others. Gloster Ridley intends to quote All's Well that Ends Well upon receiving the public reward of an honorary doctoral degree. Ridley's fate, however, is to learn that public honour is a poor compensation for his sense of inner worthlessness. Once Ridley comes to terms with his guilt over his wife's mental condition—realizes that his painful secret is common knowledge and not held against him—he discovers that he needs no compensation. The heroine's involvement with a "magnetic—but daemonic and sardonic" music teacher and "a German nobleman, disguised as a musician" in The First Violin similarly foreshadows

Monica Gall's involvement with Giles Revelstoke. The Golden Asse foreshadows the fate allotted to Revelstoke when he makes an ass of himself in rivalry with Sir Domdaniel. "You've grabbed my opera, you've grabbed my girl," Revelstoke accuses Sir Domdaniel. Like "the entrancing servant enchantress, Fotis," whose part she sings, Monica is instrumental in transforming her "master" in love and art into an ass (MF, pp. 332,320). Monica acknowledges her catalytic role in her personal life and "the mixture of elation and dread . . . as part of her professional life, part of her fate" (MF, p. 319). Unlike Monica, Macilwraith, Ridley, and Lucius, the principal character in the story of The Golden Asse, Revelstoke resists "new wisdom"—refuses to see that in conducting the opera he composed he is "meddling in magic" beyond his powers (MF, p. 316). Revelstoke refuses to acknowledge and apologize for the professional and personal humiliation he brought upon others. Thus he forfeits "both wisdom and joy," the greater wholeness, when Monica, moved by the instinct of self preservation, fails to act out the role of Isis in The Golden Asse and remove the spell. Revelstoke prefigures Boy Staunton who resists the predestined wisdom and wholeness of 'the stone' and like Boy he completes his self destruction by taking his own life. Both characters have a touch of McVarish in them.

Recurring in Davies' novels are characters who have the magician or alchemist's eye for the treasure in the refuse, which in the later novels becomes the philosopher's stone, the symbol of wholeness. Explaining the supremacy of "Ornamental Knowledge" over the "Useful Knowledge" of the machine mind to Macilwraith, Humphrey says:

> I like the mind to be a dustbin of scraps of brilliant fabric, odd gems, worthless but fascinating curiosities, tinsel, quaint bits of carving, and a reasonable amount of healthy dirt. Shake the machine and it goes out of order; shake the dustbin and it adjusts itself beautifully to its new position. (TT, p. 182)

In Leaven of Malice Humphrey voices a similar view on "musical oddities" which "[n]obody wants," like "forgotten Victorian music": "It's trash, though fascinating trash. It's the trashy art of an age which gives us its real flavour, far more than its handful of masterpieces" (pp. 130-31). Cobbler, Domdaniel, Molloy, and Revelstoke perceive the quality overlaid by shallow romanticism, convention, and inhibition in Monica's voice. Eventually, Monica herself, "under Revelstoke's guidance, develop[s] a faculty of finding worth where others had missed it, and this was to give her repertoire a quality which was the despair of her rivals (MF, p. 306). Moreover, before the first performance of Revelstoke's The Golden Asse, Domdaniel and Revelstoke, with Monica's help, revise the original score so often, with one alteration on top of the other, that it becomes "a muddle even for musicians" who nevertheless "interpreted the muddle under their eyes, and brought forth beauty" (MF, p. 316). As is evident from this list of seers, the capacity to detect or extract the jewel from the dung-heap belongs to artists in the Salterton novels. In Tempest-Tost and Leaven of Malice, however, Cobbler, in addition to his role as seer, anticipates Jungian archetypes in Davies' character development in the Deptford trilogy and The Rebel Angels. Davies' definition of one melodrama character aptly fits Cobbler who is ". . . a figure who is

easily recognizable in Jungian terms as the Mercurius, the rogue who is sometimes benevolent and sometimes a trickster, an enemy to the law and the revenue officers, but a great friend to people of noble spirit, and to lovers" (OH, p. 151). "[W]itty and irresponsible" are the characteristics Davies adds to his definition, which again fits Cobbler (OH, p. 151). Within the context of the two novels, however, Cobbler is like Puck in Midsummer Night's Dream; the darker aspect of Puck, that of Robin Goodfellow, comes through in Mr. Higgin who gets the leaven stirring in Leaven of Malice.

Davies' creation of characters and situations rooted in ancient myth, folklore and fairytales underlines their universal inner nature, or in Jungian terms, the collective unconscious, man's arcane inheritance. Davies' use of the character motifs of the seer, the fated man, and the trickster in the Salterton novels complements his use of poetic justice as the manifestation of an organizing principle which works against life denying onesidedness in human beings. Jung points out that man's wholeness of being includes a considerable degree of the unknown aspects which cannot be conveyed other than symbolically, as they appear in dreams, fantasies, visions, the arts. In the Salterton trilogy, Davies depicts symbolically rebirth but not wholeness. In the Deptford trilogy and The Rebel Angels, however, Davies uses a symbol of wholeness: the 'stone' which is identical to the philosophical tree in alchemy. Moreover, the seer, the fated man, and the trickster all connect to the central symbol. The seers in the Deptford trilogy and The Rebel Angels are identical to the alchemists who sought the philosopher's stone. Davies expands

his definition of those with the capacity to see the jewel in the dust to include all who find value where others overlook it, be they scholars, Jungians, magicians, financial wizards, scientists—occupation is of less significance than the character's superior insight and devotion to the task. Fate moves these characters towards the wholeness of the 'stone'; resistance to that fate leads them to destruction. The trickster corresponds to Mercurius, in alchemy one of the many names for the philosopher's stone which is identical to the philosophical tree. Thus the central symbols dramatize the unity they stand for in the Deptford trilogy and The Rebel Angels.

The symbol of the 'stone' in the Deptford trilogy represents a cluster of interrelated things. In addition to its relevance to character motifs the 'stone' stands for the agent of poetic justice, a being essentially unknown but which manifests itself through psychic and physical man. The symbol is Christian, yet also heathen. In Jungian theory it stands for knowledge or awareness of a self, the center where the conscious and the unconscious unite. The stone hidden in the envelope of snow in the Deptford trilogy is the objective form of the subjective reality of the philosopher's stone. The 'stone' stands for wholeness of being. It conveys man's relation to a transcendental power—an incorruptible, permanent, and divine center. Towards this center man's self must aspire. The stone in the snowball aptly resembles the astronomical sign for the sun ⊙, which is also the alchemical sign for gold, a symbol of the philosophical egg, a Gnostic image of the soul's relationship to the transcendental center which it springs from and must reunite with;

it is an emblem of androgyny, and signifies the philosopher's stone (Jung, CW 14, par. 636; 11, par. 92). Jung rejects the notion that thinkers such as the alchemists and the Gnostics were heretics. He states: "They could not and would not deny the truth of Christianity. . . . On the contrary, they wanted to" realize "the unity foreshadowed in the idea of God" (CW 14, par. 773). In his later novels Davies is in agreement with Jung in calling for a reexamination of orthodox Christianity and affirming the value of the Christian faith. The 'stone' as a symbol unites the Christian metaphor of Christ as the rejected cornerstone, the foundation of the faith, and the Jungian concept of wholeness.

The process of the philosopher's stone is a movement through opposite extremes, the stone partaking of both extremities before it settles to an equilibrium where the benevolent prevails, although it is not absolutely supreme over the malevolent. Through the narrative situation, plot, and characterization, Davies dramatizes the movement of the philosopher's stone to the opposite side. The inner process towards individuation is ongoing; the individual must repeatedly confront his unconscious aspects, battle with them, and finally integrate them into the conscious—gain the unity of the 'stone.' Jung examines this process in various death and resurrection myths, Biblical tales, fairytales, fable, folklore and legends and relates them to the alchemists' use of fantastical metaphors for the process of the philosopher's stone. In his character development Davies subtly draws on these narratives which depict the process of individuation—the mystical marriage of opposites. The mystical conjunction is the

most hazardous stage of the process of the philosopher's stone and the individuation process alike: the result of that union may be wholeness if all elements are favourable, but it may be destruction if something goes wrong in the process. Davies signals the main characters' relation to the numinous 'stone' by names which refer explicitly to some form of the word "stone" or to the transformational powers of the alchemist or the philosopher's stone. The 'stone' is thus a controlling and unifying symbol for all major elements in each of the three novels, as well as for the trilogy as a whole.

The narration in each of the three Deptford novels arises from a driving impulse to confess. Ramsay, David Staunton and Eisengrim, whose confession Ramsay records, all are secretive by nature. Each of the three, however, feels a need to explain himself to a target audience in response to someone else's onesided evaluation, and thus call attention to an injustice, correct a faulty impression, or reveal a side of himself that he has hitherto carefully concealed. They either feel entitled to poetic justice or they feel that poetic justice has granted them the chance to correct inequity.

Ramsay's target audience in Fifth Business is a father archetype who represents transcendental power and the conscious: ". . . I am driven to explain myself to you, Headmaster, because you stand at the top of that queer school world in which I have cut such a meagre figure" (pp. 13,15). Ramsay's first compulsive confession, however, is to Liesl. When Ramsay becomes "a member of Magnus Eisengrim's entourage" in Guadalupe, Ramsay tells Liesl the secret of his relationship with Eisengrim's mother. His

narration in Fifth Business recounts his life story up to the point when he received an invitation from Liesl to move to Sorgenfrei. Ramsay writes in response to "the idiotic piece that appeared in the College Chronicle in the issue of midsummer 1969" and came from the pen of that ineffable jackass Lorne Packer, M.A. and aspirant to a Ph.D." (pp. 13,14). Ramsay emphasizes: "It is not merely its illiteracy of tone that disgusts me . . ., but its presentation to the public of a portrait of myself as a typical old schoolmaster doddering into retirement with tears in his eyes and a drop hanging from his nose" (p. 13). Ramsay points out that Packer's offensively reductive "FAREWELL TO THE CORK" leaves unmentioned the marks of honour and recognition he has received, such as his V.C. and the fame of his writings. Dunstan adds:

> But what most galls me is the patronizing, dismissive tone of the piece—as if I had never had a life outside the classroom, had never rejoiced or sorrowed or known love or hate, had never, in short, been anything except what lies within the comprehension of the donkey Packer, who has known me slightly for four years. . . . Oh God! Packer, who cannot know and could not conceive that I have been cast by Fate and my own character for the vital though never glorious role of Fifth Business! (pp. 14-15)

Ramsay objects to Parker's farewell sketch because it ignores his catalytic role and his growth towards wholeness; it fails, publicly, to do him justice.

David's target audience in The Manticore is his father whose

"trust and approval" are now impossible to gain (p. 62). Boy Staunton more or less disowns his son by leaving him the grave where David's mother lies, but no legacy from the large Staunton fortune except sums allotted to legitimate children David might possibly have (pp. 35,46). David feels further cast away because in the will Boy expressed endearments for other family members and not for him (p. 46). Boy Staunton is thus intent on having the last word on his expectations of his son, emphasizing that so far David has shown competency as a lawyer but has failed to live up to his father's virility and ensure "the continuance of the Staunton name" (p. 52). Bereft of an opportunity to repond to his father's fairly public rejection, David is shattered. After shouting out, asking the Brazen Head of Friar Bacon in Eisengrim's Soirée of Illusions who had killed his father, David recognizes that he will go insane unless he seeks psychiatric help (pp. 63,65). He goes to the Jung Institute in ZUrich and his actual audience, apart from himself, is Dr. Johanna von Haller, a Jungian analyst. In response to David's distrust and his assumption that her working methods are akin to prosecution, Dr. von Haller explains: "My job is to listen to people say things they very badly want to tell but are afraid nobody else will understand" (p. 16). David's description of the physical sensation of Dr. Dyrrell's Domestic Internal Bath fits the emotional state that brings him to Zürich: "I felt like an overfilled leather bottle, and was in dread lest I should spill" (p. 81). Spill he does, reluctantly at first, but he is equally reluctant to leave for the Christmas break.

During the last session with Dr. von Haller he relates to her a dream, "Biblical in style," in which he talks to his father. David observes that in the dream his father "was very affectionate and simple in his manner, as I don't think I ever knew him to be in his life" (p. 239). David does not see his father's face but he does see Boy's "naked backside" when, suddenly ascending into the air, Boy drops his trousers (p. 239). Dr. von Haller explains that the father in the dream is David's "archetype of fatherhood," identical with "Mr. Justice Staunton" who in David's fantasy court sits in judgement over his actions (pp. 239-40,61). David's confession is similar to Ramsay's in Fifth Business, reflecting an inner conviction that he is entitled to justice: although David's fantasy court is superior to Canadian court in its acceptance of passion as well as morality, it fails to provide the full justice he needs. The narrative situation of World of Wonders emphasizes that justice must come from within, but most of all from above, as David eventually learns.

Whereas the other two confessions are private, recorded in writing, Eisengrim delivers his orally to an audience of five in World of Wonders: Jurgen Lind, Roland Ingestree, and Kinghovn, as well as Ramsay and Liesl. "If Magnus were the kind of man who could write an autobiography, this is when he would do it," says Liesl, stating that his "confessional moment" has "been impending for several months" (p. 18). Eisengrim reveals to Ramsay alone his innermost secrets, such as his smile of complicity to Willard's sexual advance. Ramsay is thus the target audience for Eisengrim's confession, a father figure akin to the two discussed above. Another

motive activates Eisengrim's confession. Ingestree is highly complimentary of Eisengrim's acting and specifically points out "that he's an actor of the rarest sort . . . a man of the first half of the nineteenth century . . ." (p. 13). Eisengrim recognizes Ingestree as the young man who fatefully scorned and rejected Sir John, Eisengrim's father in the art of acting, and is "not above giving him a smart clout, just to larn him" (p. 313). The significance of Eisengrim's revelation of his former identity as Mungo Fetch, Sir John's double, would be lost without his history previous to his treasured time with Sir John and Milady. Eisengrim states that he does not "monkey with what [he thinks] of as the Great Justice" (p. 313). Yet he relishes exposing Ingestree's contribution to the extinction of the kind of acting and actor he so admires in Eisengrim. Eisengrim has reached his confessional time but he also savours the poetic justice granted him, the chance to let Ingestree reap some of what he sowed and make him recognize the treasure he once spurned. Boy Staunton's motives for confessing to Eisengrim before committing suicide are a similar mixture of the urge to confess and the urge to retaliate. Boy wants to get back at Dunstan for having humiliated him in front of Eisengrim and challenged his superior position in their friendship and rivalry. Eisengrim, however, detects other motives: "I knew he was eager to make me his own, to enchant me, to eat me up and take me into himself. . . . He expected me to sympathize, but wolf would never turn to wolf for sympathy" (pp. 308,309). Hence Boy's confession is a manipulative ploy to dominate as well as a plea for sympathy for the

hardships of being an "Old Boy" (p. 311). When Eisengrim realizes that Boy is about to kill himself, however, he allows "the Great Justice" to run its course (p. 314).

In Ramsay's narration of World of Wonders Eisengrim's public and private confessions grant Ramsay himself poetic justice. An acclaimed historian and hagiographer, Dunstan has also written "a poetic autobiography," "an imaginative account of the life of Magnus Eisengrim," "ostensibly the work of Magnus Eisengrim" (pp. 18,21,22). Ramsay intends to use the chance to have a ghost's poetic justice: to reveal his own dual nature from beyond the grave by writing an historical account of Eisengrim's life which might throw some light on evil, and on the Devil, and complement Eisengrim's ghostwritten "autobiography." Ramsay savours the thought that when both of them are dead "the carefully tailored life of Magnus Eisengrim, which had given pleasure to so many millions . . . would be compared with the version I would prepare from Eisengrim's own confessions, and 'Ramsay says . . .' would certainly be heard loud and clear" (p. 22). Thus Ramsay foresees "an earthly form of immortality": "Historians come and go, but the document remains, and it has the importance of a thing that cannot be changed or gainsaid. Whoever wrote it continues to speak through it. . . . Thus, so far as this world is concerned, I should not wholly die" (p. 21). Ramsay has, in other words, found an alchemist's solution to the problem of matter and spirit: through his writings he is going to materialize his spirit and spiritualize the matter that will survive his and Eisengrim's death. The fictional and the historical accounts are to do justice to both of them. In

particular, the two accounts are to reveal Ramsay's artistic side which, although false modesty forbids him to admit it, he cherishes as a counterpart to his factual side, a part of his wholeness.

Self-judgement is an important part of the characters' confessions. Dr. von Haller points out to David that relating "the history of [his] battle with the trolls" is not enough; he must also judge their significance, see them for what they are as patterns of his own inner development (M, p. 208). Dr. von Haller quotes Ibsen to make a distinction between self-judgement and the battle of individuation.

> To live is to battle with trolls
> in the vaults of heart and brain.
> To write: that is to sit
> in judgement over one's self. (M, p. 208)

Davies quotes a slightly different version of the poem in One Half of Robertson Davies.

> To live—is a battle with loose-folk
> In the crypts of heart and head;
> to write—is a man's self-judgement
> As Doom shall judge the dead. (p. 124)

The alteration of the last line is significant. The first version emphasizes the individual's responsibility to his self rather than to a responsibility to a transcendental being. The father figure as a target audience is important in this context: the father represents the consciousness which governs man's actions only as long as the unconscious is willing to obey and the father also represents the

transcendental power which governs man. The confessions include each character's recognition of his responsibility for the person he was, for conscious choices in the past which made him what he is. As Eisengrim says, "a man is the sum and total of all his actions, from birth to death" (p. 258). The confessions also record a recognition of a transcendent authority: "the Great Justice," the "Poetic Justice" which "doesn't look poetic in action. . . . But part of the glory and terror of our life is that somehow, at some time, we get all that's coming to us. Everybody gets their lumps and their bouquets and it goes on for quite a while after death" (WW, p. 314). Thus the confessional narration expresses the 'stone's' role in punishment and reward for the individual's success or failure in achieving wholeness. It relates to the wholeness which involves the confessors' recognition that he is accountable for his life to himself and to a transcendental being of which his self is a part—a regulating power which restores equilibrium in death as well as life.

The plot of each Deptford novel expresses this regulating force manifesting itself in the main characters' lives. Ramsay, Boy, David, and Eisengrim: each shapes his life contrary to his parent's ideals. "We have all rejected our beginnings and become something our parents could not have foreseen," says Eisengrim to Ramsay and Boy about fifty years after Boy threw the fateful snowball (FB, p. 262). Boy could not foresee that David would thwart his father's hope of immortality in the flesh by remaining celibate, "refus[ing] to produce a successor to himself" (WW, pp. 304-5). Each of the four seeks and gains public recognition for his magic touch in his

profession—a power comparable to the philosopher's stone—his knack of discovering a jewel in the reject, transforming base matter into gold. Ramsay is a spellbinding magician in the classroom and discovers mythic jewels in history and hagiography. David "secretly [fancies] himself as a magician of the courtroom"; although from the top layer of society, he devotes his life to defending "crooks of the worst kind" (M, pp. 55,31). Eisengrim is an illusionist, "—a poetic magician who [takes] himself seriously" and in his show he highlights the sacred and profane in man, confident that he can "stand stark naked in the midst of a crowd and keep it gaping for an hour while he manipulated a few coins . . ." (FB, p. 201; WW, p. 7). Boy transforms sugar into gold and "saw that much of what had been thought of as waste from the refining process could be used as mineral supplement to poultry and stock foods" (M, p. 99). However, the true meaning of their main professional interest they find when and where they least expect it.

Ramsay in Fifth Business becomes involved in hagiography because of his search for the statue of "the Crowned Woman in Revelation" with "Mrs. Dempster's face" he saw or envisioned on the battlefield in Europe (FB, p. 77). He does not find that statue, however, until he has "abandoned hope and forgotten [his] search" (pp. 250-51). In fact, Ramsay finds the statue when he has severed "[his] association with Mrs. Dempster" both as "[his] own soul that was condemned to live in hell" and as "the little Madonna [who] cured [him]" (pp. 180,79). "[T]he hermaphrodite figure of the Great Mother" becomes one of Ramsay's most important hagiographic studies (p. 143). The "bearded lady" leads Ramsay to the "circus dedicated to St. Vitus"

where he finds Paul Dempster as Faustus Legrand (p. 144). When Ramsay meets the hermaphroditic Liesl, however, his mythical insight deserts him until he has dissociated her from the devouring side of the Great Mother and recognized his unlived emotional life. Nonetheless, the most ironic reversal concerns Ramsay's recognition of the moral meaning of the stone. Ramsay compensates for Boy's refusal to accept responsibility for the fateful stone by accepting sole responsibility for Mrs. Dempster's injury and Paul's birth, neither of which he could reasonably be held responsible for. He does not, however, accept responsibility for his own intention to hurt Boy, by presenting to him the stone and the guilt it represents, until Liesl announces from The Brazen Head of Friar Bacon that the "keeper of his conscience and keeper of the stone" was partly instrumental in Boy's death (FB, p. 266). The oracular Brazen Head, Ramsay's own brain child, causes Ramsay's heart seizure and nearly his death when he recognizes his guilt over his conscious choice to hurt his friend and enemy.

David, the court magician, gets convicted in his own fantasy court. By defending criminals, he compensates for his fear that his father's or Bill Unsworth's immortality lurks in him. David fails, nonetheless, to recognize the shortcomings of the collective ideals of justice other than on the unconscious level which drives him to seek help. When he is willing to do himself justice and accept his own redeeming features as well as the sinister ones, David literally sees the end of the condemning father figure. The judgement David craves is a recognition of the treasure he has within and he must first of all grant himself that judgement. The court has its

methods of determining official guilt, but personal worth is not its domain. David discovers his personal worth, the treasure within, in a situation parallel to his humiliating encounters with Dr. Tyrrell's Internal Bath and his confessions to Dr. von Haller. The internal Bath "cleansed" the body and the confessions were an emotional relief. When Liesl takes David to the caves of the ancestors who worshipped bears, his nonrational terror at the wind's roaring turns his "bowels to water" which "gushe[s] into [his] pants . . ." (p. 276). David overcomes the humiliation of his childhood and finds strength in his inheritance from "Maria Dymock, whom Doc Staunton had suppressed, and about whom [his] father would hear nothing after that first, unhappy letter" (M, p. 276). Thus Doc Staunton's unwed and outcast mother is the jewel in the dungheap that lends David the inner endurance necessary to survive the terror of the unseen. Despite his physical humiliation David returns from the caves a reborn man, cleansed in body, soul, and spirit.

The main plot of World of Wonders, Eisengrim's life story, is the most clearly structured by reversals and parallels. He spends half his life in misery, the other half in fame and glory. Recalling his life in Deptford, Eisengrim remembers his mother as "a perpetual reproach because [he] knew that her madness was [his] fault" (p. 90). She was ostracized as a "hoor" in Deptford and "had brought [their] family down because of [her son's] birth" (p. 91). Eisengrim says that "when Willard used [him]" he would call him a "'goodam little hoor!' And when it was over, more than once he slapped [him] mercilessly around the head, saying, 'Hoor! You're nothing but a

hoor!'" Eisengrim identifies with his mother as the "hoor" and has a new punishing father figure in Willard, who, however, lacks any redeeming features. Later, Eisengrim gains the upper hand when he destroys Abdullah, the automaton, and ends up looking after Willard as he regresses to an animal state, in an opium fog and pain. When Willard dies Eisengrim finally feels free to seek a better life. The desire to learn magic has led him away from home. The touch that sets his magic apart and above others he learns from Sir John and Milady. Eisengrim is told to "get inside Sir John" like Abdullah and thus "enter[s] upon a long apprenticeship to an egoism" (p. 172). However, Sir John's is not a destructive egoism like Willard's since it springs from a sense of inner worth, vanity, and desire for perfection that raises his art above the ordinary. Sir John's and Milady's inner strength enables them to overcome the physical ailments of old age and make their audience believe in the youthful illusion of their public roles. Thus Eisengrim gains mechanical skills from Willard and his own experiments with clockworks, but the vision that transcends the mechamism which leads him to Sorgenfrei he gains through Sir John and Milady. While in Sorgenfrei Eisengrim makes the transition from an apprentice to a master in the art of transcending mechanism and the body, and Liesl becomes his apprentice. Considering the careful balancing of parallels and opposites in Eisengrim's life, his firm faith in the regulating powers of poetic justice seems well founded.

Boy Staunton's life emerges from the total plot of the trilogy and he too experiences ironic reversals. Boy marries Leola Kruikshank,

believing her to be strong, outgoing, and fit for a figurehead. Ironically, when Boy marries Denyse Hornick who epitomizes these very qualities, he deludes himself that she is retiring and maidenly—too late he seeks a mate with Leola's actual traits. Eisengrim sees Boy's death as poetic justice. Denyse contributes to his fate by encouraging him to become Lieutenant-Governor and so forcing him to recognize his age. Since Boy largely modeled himself upon the Prince of Wales, the position of Lieutenant Governor, the representative of the Crown in Boy's province, is fitting for him. As Eisengrim reveals, Boy finally recognizes that "the Crown is in fact a tyranny of duty. . . ." (WW, p. 311). Boy, however, fails to realize the tyranny of his own "Crown," the dominance of his conscious over his unconscious side; he cannot accept responsibility for his past. Having rejected his personal past, he cannot draw from it the strength necessary to overcome the ancient, impersonal unconscious. When Eisengrim suggests that he swallow the truth of the stone, his responsibility for past actions and the unavoidable decay of flesh, he attempts to swallow the stone itself and commits suicide to avoid the truth. He resembles Cronus who swallowed his children to avoid being dethroned by his son, but could neither escape time nor his fate when he swallowed a stone in place of Zeus. Boy thus allows the Great Earth Mother, often represented by water or sea, to devour him. Boy is the only one of the four principal male characters whose "alchemist" vision never rises above the material process of transforming base matter into hard, glittering gold.

The symbolic meaning of the 'stone' provides the subtext of the Deptford trilogy, just as Eisengrim's life story is the subtext of the film where he plays the leading role. Davies conveys subtext through allusions to man's collective unconscious as it appears in myth, legend, fable, and alchemy. In the text, Davies subtly threads together references to myth, legend, romance, fairytale, heraldry, tales of magic, the Bible, fable, alchemy, Gnosticism, hagiography, heraldry, and astrology. All except the fable display superhuman powers working upon man. Furthermore, all express the special significance of animals: sacred animals, animals representing aspects of man, super- or subhuman powers, metamorphosis of god or man into animal form, battles with animals. Davies' allusions serve a twofold purpose: they relate to man's predestined wholeness and they emphasize that the rough path to wholeness transcends the orthodox Christian path to purity.

Rebirth, heroic battles, and the union of opposites are stages of individuation. Rebirth or resurrection is a central concern in myth and mysticism. A heroic battle with an animal or a non-human creature is a recurring motif in myth, legend, fable, alchemy, romance, and hagiography. Victory in the battle usually demands superior physical strength, inner firmness, the intervention of a supernatural power or the possession of an object of supernatural powers, or the capacity to outwit the enemy. The union of opposites is often represented by a god, a mythic animal or monster, a human figure, or a 'stone' which are somehow androgynous in nature or form. Davies' allusions are so varied and interrelated that even a brief exploration

is a challenging task. However, the following examination is an attempt to bring to the surface some of Davies' subtext development of wholeness through allusions to animals in relation to the 'stone.'

Mercurius and Saturn are identical to the philosopher's stone in alchemy, and the animals Davies refers to, either by name or by their traditionally assigned characteristics, relate to one or both figures. "The animal is a representative of the unconscious," says Jung (CW 5, par. 503). The archetypes sometimes appear in animal form and, discussing the archetype of the spirit, the old man, Jung observes:

> This belongs essentially to the theriomorphism of gods and demons and has the same psychological significance. The animal form shows that the contents and functions in question are still in the extrahuman sphere, i.e., on a plane beyond human consciousness, and consequently have a share on the one hand in the daemonically superhuman and on the other in the bestially subhuman. (CW 9, par. 419)

Jung emphasizes that the paradoxical qualities of the animal do not appear irreconcilable to the unconscious—only to the conscious and the self-willed ego: "Neither for the primitive nor for the unconscious does his [the old man's] animal aspect imply any devaluation, for in certain respects the animal is superior to man" (CW 9, pars. 419-420). The individual must battle with the animal or the monster:

> This is in keeping with the violence of all unconscious dynamism. In this manner the god manifests himself and in this form he must be overcome. . . . The onslaught of instinct then becomes an experience of divinity, provided that man does not

succumb to it and follow it blindly. (CW 5, par. 324)

Jung emphasizes the necessity of confronting the monstrous archetypes:

> . . . only one who has risked the fight with the dragon and is not overcome by it wins the hoard, 'the treasure hard to attain.' He alone has a genuine claim to self-confidence, for he has faced the dark ground of his self and thereby gained himself. This experience gives him faith and trust, the pistis in the ability of the self to sustain him, for everything that menaced him from inside he has made his own. He has acquired the right to believe that he will be able to overcome all future threats by the same means. (CW 14, par. 756)

Jung suggests that giving form to the archetypes eases the battle towards rebirth, totality, in some cases, whereas in others a psychic collapse occurs at a preliminary stage (CW 14, par. 755). Liesl lends shape to the terrifying unconscious that Eisengrim, Ramsay, and David must overcome. All the main characters, however, reflect some aspects of Mercurius or his alchemical father, Saturn.

Jung describes Mercurius as consisting "of all conceivable opposites": a duality, yet a unity; material and spiritual; "the process by which the lower and material is transformed into the higher and spiritual, and vice versa"; "He is the devil, a redeeming psychopomp, an evasive trickster, and God's reflection in physical nature" (CW 13, par. 284). Mercurius is a shapeshifter and enjoys sly jokes and malicious pranks (CW 9i, par. 255). He is a "unifying agent," "a peacemaker," a "mediator between the warring elements and producer of unity . . ." (CW 14, par. 10). As Hermes, Mercurius "is a god of

thieves and cheats, but also a god of revelation who gave his name to a whole philosophy" (Jung, CW 13, par. 281). Mercurius is androgynous and "represents on the one hand the self and on the other the individuation process and because of the limitless number of his names, also the collective unconscious" (CW 13, par. 284). The animals related to Mercurius are also numerous.

The most memorable animal characteristics ascribed to Liesl are those of the monkey, the ape. At first sight Eisengrim mistakes Liesl for a monkey; "so I waved to it and grinned, as one does at monkeys" (WW, p. 280). In Christianity the monkey and the ape represent the negative, evil aspects of man. In Reynard the Fox, which thumbs its nose at the hypocrisy of the church and the culpability of the state, however, Dame Rukenaw, the she ape, shows entirely different aspects. Dame Rukenaw is "exceeding wise and durst boldly speak." When Reynard the Fox is being tried by Noble the lion, she cautions that every man should know himself before passing judgement on others and insists that if every man present were "to call to account all the actions of his life," he would have pity for her cousin the fox (p. 161). The ape also comes to Reynard's rescue in his battle with Isegrim the wolf, and her cunning saves Reynard's life. Dame Rukenaw's insistence on self-knowledge and humaneness as more important than harsh judgement and retribution accords with Liesl's counsel to Ramsay in Fifth Business. Liesl's mercurial trickster nature also embraces the cunning of the she ape. Moreover, the monkey has been a sacred animal, a benevolent deity for various groups, such as Central American Indians and the Ancient Egyptians. The Egyptian Thoth,

from whom the hermaphroditic Hermes Trismegistus and Mercurius are derived, was depicted as a human form with the head of a doglike baboon or an ape (Jung, CW 12, par. 173). Thoth was a magician, the messenger and interpreter of the gods, a healer, an awakener, a rectifier of disturbances, Osiris' right hand, the controller of Ra's intelligence, a time regulator, healer of the sun's eye during the night, celestial wisdom, and from him the word thought is derived. Thoth belongs to the death and rebirth motif in myth. Liesl has a lot in common with Thoth but before her redemptive qualities surface she must experience rebirth herself.

Liesl's monkeylike form when she first meets Eisengrim is caused by a physical malfunction which she has despaired of conquering: she has allowed herself to regress to an animal state—given in to the unconscious and to matter. She looks like a monkey and her speech sounds to her "like the bark of a dog" (WW, p. 283). Eisengrim's romantic, nineteenth century," well-groomed handsomeness speaks of all she yearns for but despairingly rejects (WW, p. 284). In response to Eisengrim's use of animal-training tactics in handling her (which he continues even after he realizes that she is human), Liesl is ready to destroy him like her grandfather's mechanical toys. Deep inside Liesl thinks: "[I]f Fate had a blow, why didn't Fate strike [her grandfather]" who is "so old, so near to death, so capable of living the life he liked" yet full of unwanted pity for his grandaughter (WW, p. 283). Liesl transfers all the resentment she projects upon her grandfather to Eisengrim who shares his old-fashioned touches of refinement and has a magic touch with her grandfather's clockwork

toys. In the battle, when Liesl is intent on killing Eisengrim, his brutal past comes to his rescue and he overpowers her. His strength and his unsympathetic attitude towards her force her to differentiate between him and her grandfather. Furthermore, Eisengrim demands that she show respect for the mechanical monkey orchestra as a work of the past needing skillful and patient restoration after her destructiveness. He challenges her identification with the mechanical monkeys. Through working with him on the restoration Liesl claims her heritage, both personal and mythic, since time regulation and eye healing are part of the family heritage and are attributes of Thoth. Liesl and Eisengrim's second battle completes her individuation process: the opposites come together in a physical union with Liesl as "the loathly Lady in the Arthurian stories" and Eisengrim as the chivalrous Sir Gawain (WW, p. 290). Looking back Liesl says, "I looked like an ape. I still look like an ape, but I have made my apishness serve me and now it doesn't really matter" (WW, p. 281). Hence Eisengrim is Liesl's philosopher's stone. She learns to see beyond external appearance, beginning with Eisengrim's and gradually her own, to the buried treasure—the self—the 'stone.'

The dual nature of the philosopher's stone is reflected in Liesl's androgyny and in her various names. Physically, Liesl has strong male characteristics. As Ramsay notes, her clothing combines a mixture of traditional masculinity and delicate femininity, and she is bisexual. The first part of Liesl's given name is "Lis-" which in French means "lily," "fleur de lis." Jung observes that

> the lily was conceived to be Mercurius and the quintessence itself—the noblest thing that human meditation can reach.

> The red lily stands for the male and the white for the female in the coniunctio, the divine pair that unite in the hierosgamos. The lily is therefore a true 'gamonymus' in the Paraklesan sense. (CW 14, par. 689)

In her choice of an artistic surname while touring with Eisengrim, however, Liesl stresses her demonic side. She explains her name as "[a] delicate compliment to Magnus" as a Faust figure since "the least of the demons attending on the great magician is Vitzlipützli" (WW, p. 295). Thus their relationship is identical to Thoth's relationship to Osiris. C. H. Ibsershoff in his "Vitzlipützli" and Gertrud Lewis in her "Vitzlipützli Revisited" examine Liesl's chosen surname. Their most interesting finding is its correspondence to Huitzilopochtli, the Aztec god which devours human beings. This links Liesl with the devouring mother in her battles with Eisengrim and Ramsay. Liesl's private resumption of her family name, Naegeli, signals acceptance of her heritage of romance, so much a part of Sorgenfrei. Naegeling was the name of Beowulf's magic sword, with which he slew the dragon. Thus in accepting her family name Liesl acknowledges the wolf and the dragon within herself, as well as her capacity to slay the latter. Liesl's given name and its shortened version are, however, most significant in relation to her role as the catalyst in Eisengrim, Ramsay and David's rebirth to greater wholeness. The latter part of Liesl's given name sounds close to 'allotter' and she is indeed the allotter of the 'stone' to the three gentlemen. Moreover, 'lísan,' in Anglo Saxon means to release, redeem, deliver and 'lísing' means a freeman. Thus Liesl's names reflect her movement from a recognition of her shadow

nature to a recognition of her redemptive side.

Whereas the numinous animal aspect most prevalent in Liesl is the monkey, Eisengrim's is the wolf. "Isgrim," "Isegrim," "Isengrim" are a few of the many variations of the wolf's name in Reynard the Fox where Liesl finds the name. In the fable, Isegrim is Reynard's strong adversary, greedy for power. The wolf is, nevertheless, sacred to the various gods, such as Apollo, Cronus, Saturn, and Osiris. Furthermore, Jung quotes an "invocation to Hermes" in which two of his four forms are "a dog-headed baboon" and "a wolf" (CW 13, par. 359). Eisengrim does not express any awareness of his wolfishness, however, until he recounts becoming Sir John's shadow. "We wolves like to possess things, and especially people," says Eisengrim; "We are unappeasably hungry. There is no reason or meaning in the hunger. It just exists, and possesses you" (WW, p. 307). Eisengrim does not identify his drive "to possess [Sir John], to make him [his]" until he meets Liesl who names him:

> I took the name, and recognized the fact, and thereby got it out of my depths so that at least I could be aware of it and take a look at it now and then. I won't say I domesticated the wolf, but I knew where his lair was, and what he might do. (WW, p. 306)

Thus Eisengrim makes the heroic choice to live by the wolf's lair without attempting to kill it. "Eisengrim" means a "warrior's mask," "ice-mask" in German and Eisengrim does indeed integrate his heroic aspects, the hardness of steel and ice, and the wolf, into her persona. The various forms of Isegrim which in German refer to a sullen or surly person also fit Eisengrim when thwarted. However, like Liesl, Eisengrim

makes his animal nature serve him as an artist and as an individual. When Eisengrim has "trampled his old enemy" Ingestree "into the dirt," Ramsay compares Eisengrim to "a scorpion, which had discharged its venom, and was frisky and playful in consequence" (WW, p. 256). In the Tarot cards, which supposedly survived from the Thoth/Hermes Trismegistus cult, the scorpion signifies "the Justice." Thus both the wolf and the scorpion point to the philosopher's stone, the process of poetic justice which Eisengrim firmly believes in.

However, as stated earlier, Eisengrim does not identify his animal nature until he meets Liesl. In her monkeylike form Liesl stands for everything he has rejected in his past. She is like Rango in The Wanless World of Wonders, and reminds him of his own animal life in the circus when he set his hopes no higher than to survive. In his first battle with Liesl, however, Eisengrim draws on the survival methods he learned during that time. The second battle is different. Through seven years of Willard's sexual abuse Eisengrim has come to fear sexual involvement as painful and humiliating, and does not expect heterosexual involvement to be any different. Whereas Eisengrim realizes his animal capacity as necessary for survival in the first battle and thereby gains the animal strength of the monkey, in the second battle both he and Liesl gain the strength of the union of opposites. The wolf and the dog-headed baboon come together. In restoring Eisengrim's male sexuality, Liesl is like Isis who searched for the scattered parts of Osiris' body, guarded by seven scorpions, and assembled all parts except the phallus which she eventually located by tricking Ra into revealing where it was hidden.

According to this rebirth myth, Set, who corresponds to Saturn, annually slays and scatters the parts of Osiris, and Isis restores him to wholeness and power. Saturn is sometimes described in alchemy as the leaden state of Mercurius, his father, and Eisengrim describes Willard's face in death as of "a leaden colour" (WW, p. 133). Through Eisengrim, Liesl in turn gains insight into the world of the spirit, the world of wonders; while working with him on the restoration of the clockwork toys she destroyed, she "was moving through clockwork to the Magian World View" (WW, p. 288). Time and clockwork are the realm of Cronos, who is identified with Saturn; the time of their reign was called the Golden Age, akin to "the Golden World" Liesl shares with Eisengrim and Ramsay (WW, p. 11). Eisengrim, however, withdraws his identification with his mother: with Willard he has seen himself as a "hoor" and thus identical to his mother. Hence when Eisengrim and Liesl's union restores their sexual confidence; he incorporates the anima or soul into his being, whereas Liesl connects with the spirit. Each is the other's philosopher's stone.

In a way, the name Magnus Eisengrim both reflects spiritual duality and his wholeness of being. All his life until Sir John and Milady die, Eisengrim is treated as non-human, a thing or an animal; by his father, by Willard, and by Sir John and Milady who do, however, show him some respect. His warrior or hero nature, his capacity to seize each moment of joy, his feelings of never being totally abandoned by God, as well as his wolfish greed to make the skills of his father-figures part of himself, together keeps him alive. Duality of light and shadow runs through all

of Eisengrim's earlier names. Because St. Paul persecuted Christians before he was converted and his earlier years were the shadow aspect of him as a saint. Dempster suggests both the connotations of tempter and redemption. Cass, the name Willard coined from an advertisement for castor oil, relates to Castor, one of the twins born to Leda and Zeus from the two eggs she produced. Castor gained immortality as an evening star, Pollux, his twin, as the morning star. Eisengrim's premature birth ensued when Boy's snowball, containing an egg-shaped stone, hit Mrs. Dempster and Eisengrim was nurtured to life like an egg in a warm nest. Castor relates also to evening and shadow. Mungo was a name used for blacks, particularly slaves. Britain has, however, a St. Mungo. A fetch is someone's double (WW, p. 188). Thus all of the earlier names chosen for Eisengrim are inherently dual, like his sexual experience; they express both the shadow and the redemptive side of the self. Eisengrim is a fitting name for someone whose existence has been mostly as someone's shadow, but who has greedily gobbled up the redeeming aspects of those whose shadow he was. Magnus, meaning the great, is an echo of the only name Eisengrim chose for himself, Faustus LeGrand. Like Albertus Magnus, Faustus is an alchemist and LeGrand means 'the great.' Therefore, Eisengrim's final name relates to both the transformational powers of the 'stone' and its wholeness.

Ramsay differs from Liesl and Eisengrim in that he does not openly acknowledge the animal side of himself, although his narration gives hints of its identity or presence. Considering that both the ape and the wolf in Raynard the Fox appear in Ramsay's texts, one would

expect Reynard himself to be lurking somewhere in the background. The fact that Ramsay nowhere identifies himself as a fox is perhaps the best evidence that he is that sly fellow. More concrete evidences, however, are Ramsay's references to himself as a "crafty," grown man and "so clever, so sly, so spiteful" when a boy (FB, pp. 9, 22). His narration demonstrates his secretiveness by concealing that a stone was in the snowball until it must be disclosed. As Reynard conquers the wolf, so does Ramsay eventually conquer his life-long friend and rival Boy Staunton who, like Eisengrim, is a wolf although unconscious of it. Similarly, Ramsay outsmarts Eisengrim and eventually gets not only his life story, but also the details of Boy Staunton's death which are crucial to Ramsay and to the work that is to put him above all the other characters by ensuring him immortality in this world. Ramsay's own wolfishness, however, is evident in his extreme possessiveness of Mrs. Dempster. Like the wolf, the fox relates to "'evasive' Mercurius" and Saturn (Jung, CW 13, par. 241n; 9ii, par. 129). Liesl and Eisengrim emphasize the 'royal' aspect of themselves. Ramsay does not, yet he is attracted to the royal animal, the lioness, whose Termagant shadow aspect he feared in his mother. He competes with Boy for the affections of Leola. He has an affair with Diana Marfleet; the goddess Diana is also associated with lions. Discussing the battle of the Rex and Regina, or the two lions, preceding the coniunctio, Jung says: "The lion has among other things an unmistakable erotic aspect. Thus the 'Introitus apertus' says: 'Learn what the doves of Diana are, who conquer the lion with caresses; the green lion, I say, who in truth is the Babylonish dragon, who kills

all with his venom'" (CW 14, par. 408). Faustina has no soothing doves like Diana and whereas Ramsay can resist Leola and Diana, he cannot resist this "animal" who was born in the Amazon territory and "eats like a lioness" (FB, pp. 218,208). The battle between Ramsay and Liesl is like the alchemical one between the Rex and the Regina.

Liesl combines the shadow aspects of the two dominant anima figures in Ramsay's life when she comes to his room, intent on having her way with him, as a replacement for Faustina whose lover she is. Whereas Ramsay loves Faustina, he confesses: ". . . I hated Liselotte VitzlipUtzli" (FB, p. 211). Dunstan can romanticize the "weakness of the flesh" in Faustina as he did in Mrs. Dempster: he sees the animal simplicity of the first and the madness of the latter, or their unconsciousness, as an excuse for their Harlot behaviour. Liesl, however, is anything but unconscious of her intentions. Liesl possesses in abundance practicality, and the mental and physical strength Dunstan's mother and Deptford favoured. However, she also demonstrates the Termagant side of Mrs. Ramsay's "lionlike spirit" by her intent to overpower and possess Dunstan (FB, p. 22). "The lion . . . is the symbol of . . . frenzied desire," says Jung, and Ramsay's victory over Liesl resolves the conflict between his two animas; his fear of being devoured by his mother, as he insists his father was, and his refusal to accept Mrs. Dempster's willingness to have sex as anything but madness (Jung, CW 5, par. 425). When Ramsay twists Liesl's nose as St. Dunstan did the Devil's, he signals his recognition that this "Swiss gargoyle" is his personal devil (FB,

p. 223). Before Ramsay and Liesl's union, which to him was "a deep delight" with an unsurpassed "aftermath of healing tenderness," Liesl explains why she came to his room: "I wanted to tell you that you are human, like other people" (FB, p. 225). The counsels she gives Ramsay are similar to Padre Blazon's earlier in Ramsay's life; both stress the necessity of self-knowledge and wholeness (FB, pp. 177-8,225-7). Liesl asks: "How can you be good to anybody if you are not good to yourself?" (FB, p. 226).

Indeed Ramsay later realizes that his care for Mrs. Dempster was possessiveness rather than love: "She was mine" (FB, p. 180). When Ramsay shatters Mrs. Dempster's illusion that Paul is still a boy he is withdrawing his anima projection. The consequences are that Mrs. Dempster's mental and physical health rapidly deteriorate, and on her deathbed she breaks the bond when she returns to the realm of time and reality, asking Ramsay "Are you Dunstable Ramsay?" (FB, p. 244). Releasing him from his anima relation by "a little tug" of the hand before dying, Mrs. Dempster looks to Ramsay "like a small, elderly woman ready for burial" (FB, pp. 244,245). Thus Blazon's prophecy that Ramsay's life may possibly "be purchased at the price of hers and that this may be God's plan for [Ramsay] and [Mrs. Dempster]" is fulfilled (FB, p. 177). Only in retrospect is Ramsay able to accept this fate as a part of his role, which Liesl defines as "Fifth Business" (FB, p. 227). Fifth Business corresponds to Paracelsus' "spirit of the fifth essence" who "in his original Saturnine darkness . . . is unclean, but he purifies himself progressively. . . . Finally, in the fifth essence, he appears as the

'clarified body'" (Jung, CW 13, par. 167). Fifth Business also corresponds to the fifth element in the union of the Rex and the Regina: "The 'Maid' appears in the fifth. . . . The Maid is 'crowned,' and in her we recognized the crowned Virgin, the Queen of Heaven . . ."; she "is the feminine half of Mercurius" (Jung, CW 14, par. 450). Saturn corresponds to Set who, according to the Egyptian rebirth myth, was ritually slain by fire. Ramsay's miraculous survival from the battlefields in Europe relates to both the feminine and the masculine aspect of Mercurius: Ramsay attributes his survival to "the Crowned Woman" he sees before he loses consciousness from the severe burns (FB, pp. 77-9). Ramsay's search for the statue he thinks he saw on the battlefield bears no fruit until after Mrs. Dempster's death and after Blazon has identified the significance of Ramsay's involvement with Mrs. Dempster and Liesl. Blazon identifies Ramsay as a hero. He explains: "Heroism in God's cause is the mark of the saint. . . . You are fit to be the Devil's friend, without any fear of losing yourself to him!" (FB, pp. 249-50). Thus Ramsay goes through the process of the philosopher's stone, moves towards the wholeness of the 'stone,' although he is reluctant to admit any of the attributes of Mercurius in himself other than his foxy secrecy, cunning, and sly jokes.

Dunstan's names, like Liesl and Eisengrim's, define his relationship to the 'stone'—record his progress towards its wholeness. The first part of Ramsay's family name is "Ra-" or "Ram-." Ra was the supreme deity of the Egyptians. One of his symbols is ram's horns and he was sometimes represented as a lion. The ram was sacrificed to

Ares, Hermes, and Mercurius. Ares corresponds to Horus who, like the other gods, is a mythic god of rebirth and is sometimes identified with Osiris, who corresponds to Uranus. The name Ramsay, like Liesl and Dempster, relates to the redeemer, "the lamb" of God. Jung refers to passages in the Bible where the metaphor of Christ as the lamb "rather gives one the sinister impression of a daemonic ram, and not at all of a lamb who is led meekly to the slaughter," suggesting "a psychological shadow-figure, . . . united at the end of time with the triumphant Christ, through an act of rebirth" (CW 9ii, par. 167). Boy Staunton mistakes Ramsay for a meek lamb and suffers the consequences. Eisengrim observes: "he thought he had eaten you, Ramsay, but you were like those fairy-tale figures who cut their way out of the giant's belly" (WW, p. 308). The latter part of Ramsay's name is written "-say" but pronounced "see"; as the narrator of two of the novels he does indeed both "see" and "say." However, when Diana renames Ramsay she compares him to St. Dunstan who was

> . . . mad about learning, terribly stiff and stern and scowly, and an absolute wizard at withstanding temptation. . . . [T]he Devil once came to tempt him in the form of a fascinating woman, and he caught her nose in his goldsmith's tongs and gave it a terrible twist. (FB, p. 93)

St. Dunstan certainly corresponds to Ramsay. More importantly, the change of name involves a rejection of "-stable" in Dunstable, which suggests onesidedness. Moreover, Ramsay's new name acknowledges the stone which redirected the course of his life: stone in Old English is "stan." "Dunstan" gives credit to Ramsay's dual nature, brings to

the surface the stone and the desire for revenge he conceals, alludes to the symbolic death and rebirth Dunstan's recognition of the stone's meaning calls for. Ramsay's revised first name differs from Liesl and Eisengrim's names in that it refers to the concrete stone as well as the metaphysical one, which is appropriate since Ramsay intends to gain immortality of spirit in matter.

David recognizes his animal characteristics through analysis, whereas the other three characters identify theirs through experience. With the help of Dr. von Haller he brings the animals to the surface, but through Liesl's intervention he discovers his animal weakness and strength. The fox is the animal which helps David overcome his paralyzing terror in the caves with Liesl. The crest Adrian Pledger-Brown drew for David's great-grandmother had "a fox statant guardant within his jaws a sugar cane, all proper" (M, p. 215). The motto is: "Out of the strong come forth sweetness" (M, p. 215). The fox is David's spiritual strength which joins with that aspect of his soul inherited from "Mary Dymock the Angel" and animates his reluctant body in a rebirth to greater wholeness (M, p. 213). The invisible adversary in the cave is David's animal helper, the bear. Felix, David's stuffed bear was the comforter his mother gave to him, but the bear often signifies the devouring mother, the unconscious, and the body that must be overcome. "Lion and unicorn are both symbols of Mercurius," and they are the "supporters" in David's fantasy court (Jung, CW 12, par. 518; Davies, M, p. 61). David's profession as a defender of thieves and cheats links him with Mercurius and Hermes. The manticore is, however, the most memorable animal in David's dream life. It

combines the lion—the noble animal his father associated with most openly—a human face, and a stinging tail. Dr. von Haller interprets the manticore as David in court (M, p. 164). The manticore symbolizes wholeness, as do the lion and the hermaphroditic unicorn.

David's heroic battle is linked to Reynard the Fox and the hero's battle with the dragon in fairytales. When he meets Eisengrim, David recognizes a fellow "Isegrim" and thinks: "I have slain and devoured many an impudent witness in the courts, and I am not to be bamboozled by a mountebank" (M, pp. 252-3). David's friend Pledger-Brown corresponds to his animal friend, the bear. However, like Reynard who outwits Bruin, David must overcome his fear of the roaring "bear" in the caves. Netty corresponds to the bear as the devouring mother. David describes Netty as a fire breathing dragon who "considers herself [his] keeper" (M, p. 77). In his childhood, David has a recurring dream of himself "in a castle or fortress, . . . and [he] was the keeper of a treasure—or sometimes it seemed to be a god or idol—the nature of which [he] never knew though its value was great in [his] mind" (M, p. 92). Netty's reaction is to ban ". . . The Little Lame Prince, in which a lonely boy lived in a tower . . ." (M, p. 92). Netty with her Deptford distrust of knowledge is like a dragon guarding the treasure; David must overcome this dragon side of his anima in order to gain the treasure of self-knowledge, discover his spiritual center.

David's name is significant in connection to his inner growth. He needs to come to terms with his father's death and his own disinheritance; more importantly, he must confront the father figure

which represents the infantile consciousness from which a superior consciousness is born, represented as a son, and judge the value of his inheritance from his family, his younger self, and other people who affected his life. Just as Absalom rebelled against King David David rebelled against Boy, and the condemming father figure which dominated his inner life. Ironically, Boy reenacts Cronus by putting the stone in his mouth before killing himself; Boy's death is the catalyst which leads to David's inner rebirth and discovery of his inner legacy, the 'stone.' Davies emphasizes the connection between "staun-" and "stone" by having one of the criminals David serves as a defendant call him "Meester Stown" (M, p. 220). David's sister Caroline marries Beeston Bastable and thus in a way keeps her legacy of the 'stone,' although David's narration does not suggest that she seeks or discovers its significance. Like the Biblical king, David must battle with a lion and a bear, and slay a Goliath with a stone. Both Ramsay and David are concerned with the guilt connected to the eggshaped stone and their names refer to the material object. Ramsay throws away the stone when both of them have learned to divine its meaning instead of clinging to the object.

David fulfills the fate his father evades: he gains the insight into spirit, soul, and body his father resists. Boy subjects spirit, soul, and body to his will: he creates a mercenary, hedonistic God in his own image, seeks to impress his own image upon his son and the two women he marries, and uses money to manipulate—and the body to dominate—other people. He maintains the youthful appearance of a boy. Jung observes that "the vulgar designation of the penis [is]

'boy,'" yet "the boy" also "means some form of spirit"—signif[ying] the infantile shadow" when "negative" (CW 5, par. 212; par. 396). Boy neither lives up to the role of the chivalric Percival nor the capacity to "perceive" his first name Percy suggests; he perceives only by his senses. He is a degenerate version of the romantic hero; not one who in the name of God seeks the Holy Grail and defends ladies and others in distress. Boy "pierces" (the French meaning of Percival) like "a swordsman [who] is an expert at sticking something long and thin, or thick and curved, into other people; and always with the intent to wound" (M, p. 186). Boy's second name, Boyd, means "yellow-haired," which identifies him as "the blond beast," the term Jung uses for Nietzsche due to his definition of the Dionysian impulse as aesthetic and sensational only. Jung sees Nietzsche's definition as a falsification of the "essentially religious" aspect of the "dionysus cult" (CW 6, par. 231). "The cult of the 'blond beast,'" says Jung, is typical of our age and stems from the subjectification of "the God-concept." The main characteristic of this cult is "extreme . . . individualism, representing a new form of detachment from the world, the immediate danger of which is re-submersion in the unconscious dynamis" (CW 6, par. 433). Jung defines the "Dionysian impulse" as "'rapturous delight' in [the] destruction" of the individuation principle, "comparable to intoxication, which dissolves the individual into his collective instincts and components—[yet is also] an explosion of the isolated ego through the world" (CW 6, par. 227). True to this paradoxical nature of the Dionysian blond beast, Boy's "demeanour," as Ramsay recalls it, "was that of one of

the lords of creation," yet, "It was characteristic of Boy throughout his life that he was always the quintessence of something that somebody else had recognized and defined" (FB, p. 114).

Boy's second wife Denyse Hornick is the Dionysian impulse in the flesh. Her first name is a feminine version of "Dionysus" and her last name is a combination of "horn" and one of the names of the Devil, old "Nick." Furthermore, as Jung notes, Nietzsche referred to the conflict between Dionysian and Apollonian values as "'a problem with horns'" (CW 6, par. 232). "Apollo 'rules over the beautiful illusion of the inner world of fantasy,' he is 'the god of all shape-shifting powers,'" Jung quotes Nietzsche (CW 6, par. 226). Boy never gains insight into the Appolonian values and Denyse puts a fitting, final Dionysian stamp on Boy with the death-mask that cannot be removed. This macabre touch reminds the reader of Boy's emphasis on the public "mask," the persona. "The stone-in-the-snowball has been characteristic of too much you've done for you to forget it forever," Ramsay warns Boy (FB, p. 264). Eisengrim advises him: "'I'd do my best to swallow that stone'" (WW, p. 312). Boy follows that advice in his characteristic manner. As Ramsay puts it: "'The stone in the snowball: the stone in the corpse's mouth—always a nasty surprise for somebody'" (WW, p. 315). Although Boy evades the conflict between the Appolonian and the Dionysian values, David must confront and resolve it.

David breaks away from the Dionysian streak, his dependency upon intoxication, which he explains as the nick in his public mask—the romantic flaw in the rich, successful "character of David Staunton . . ." (M, p. 233). David's quest for the significance of "the stone in the

corpse's mouth" leads him to the inner meaning of the 'stone'—a union of weakness and strength, matter and soul, soul and spirit, Mother and Father. Like Ramsay, Liesl, and Eisengrim, David realizes his Apollonian, Mercurial, shape-shifting inner nature—the divine yet bestial part of his heroic self. All except Boy learn that the mask is akin to the 'stone' in that the self is a part of it yet also lies below and beyond it. They discover that justice is a part of the stone yet ultimately transcends its objective reality like the philosopher's stone.

The 'stone' is a religious symbol in the Deptford trilogy. Recalling the myth of Chronos, it signifies the fate that cannot be avoided. However, the egglike shape and the pink color of the stone which shape the action in the three novels are significant. The egg is a universal symbol for creation—the order the creator imposes upon chaos—and an alchemical symbol for "a king of matrix or uterus from which . . . the miraculous stone is to be born" (Jung, CW 12, par. 338). The easter egg is a specifically Christian symbol, although initially borrowed from Egyptian rites in honour of the sun's recreation. The easter egg is an emblem of resurrection, rose coloured or red to signify the blood shed for man's salvation. Hence the 'stone' is a numinous symbol which unites the religious instincts behind pagan myth, and orthodox as well as unorthodox Christianity.

Davies rejects the notion that God died or disappeared after having created the clockwork of the universe. Through the subtext Davies reinforces the characters' expressed belief in an understructure, a "clockwork," or, in other words, a predetermined fate which

moulds man's life. Through allusions to rebirth motifs in the Bible, and Classical and Egyptian myth, as well as in the alchemical process of the philosopher's stone, Davies shows man's collective fate to be continued rebirth in the progress towards wholeness. Davies depicts each character's individual fate through hero motifs. Dunstan's heroic role is that of a saint, David is a fairytale hero, Liesl is an enchanted romance heroine, and Eisengrim is a chivalric hero. Each character has free will to accept or reject his fate. All of the main characters fulfill their destined inner journey except for Boy: he makes a mockery of his role as a chivalrich hero. In their battle for greater wholeness of self, the characters must draw on inner resources which are both less, and greater, than human. Davies depicts this power as animals. The various animals are archetypal symbols for divinity, be the faith Christian or non-Christian. Victory in the battle with the destructive side of the unconscious involves the characters' capacity to acknowledge and draw on the animal strength of their personal unconscious, their own past; otherwise, like Boy Staunton, they fall victim to the destructive powers of the collective unconscious. Boy thus reaps what he sows: his concern in life is for matter only and he falls victim to the inborn tendency of matter towards inertia, having no inner strength to battle against it. Ramsay, Liesl, and Eisengrim, however, go to Sorgenfrei and thus reap what they have sown. Sorgenfrei is a state of mind no less than it is a place: it is an inner Golden Age, the reward to those who gain enough spiritual strength to let their frailties of mind and body serve them and can therefore face old age

with dignity, "free of care." Poetic justice is thus the manifestation that "God is here, and Christ is now," as Father Knopwood tells David (M, p. 135). "The great sin," as Father Knopwood explains ". . . quite possibly the Sin against the Holy Ghost—[is] to use yourself or someone else contemptuously, as an object of convenience"; "the Sin against the Holy Ghost [will] not be forgiven, . . . and the retribution [will] be in this world (M, p. 135). "[A]nd it goes on for quite a while after death," observes Eisengrim (WW, p. 314). Within the world of the Deptford trilogy an active, transcendent power manifests its existence through coincidence (synchronicity, as Jung calls it), through poetic justice.

Man's quest for knowledge of himself and the transcendent authority that works upon man is at the core of The Rebel Angels, symbolized by the philosopher's stone which is also "the biblical stone which the builders refused becoming the headstone of the corner," identical in meaning to the philosophical tree which is also the tree of knowledge (p. 82). Hollier identifies this quest as "Salvation in dirt," which demands that the refuse be reexamined (p. 82). As in the Deptford trilogy, the dual symbol at the center of The Rebel Angels stands for the redemption of spirit through body, of the conscious through the unconscious. By including the tree of knowledge, however, Davies emphasizes the role of evil in the redemptive process which leads to wholeness: he affirms that knowledge of evil is crucial to man's wholeness of being.

Davies stresses in the Deptford trilogy that man's inner life is fated; in The Rebel Angels he suggests that matter also adheres to

inner law and that fighting against it is as destructive as fighting psychic or spiritual fate. Davies develops the characters' attitude to matter and spirit through parallels. Froats seeks to uncover some of the mysteries of the body through scientific study of human excrement. He explains to Darcourt and Theotoky that microscopical studies show "a disposition toward a characteristic form which is pretty constant" (p. 111). Froats views faeces as "a creation, a highly characteristic product" (p. 109). Insisting that a scientist should not approach his study with preconceived ideas, Froats suggests, nevertheless, that the miniscule patterns in excrement may be even more precise indicators of physiological and psychological types than the Sheldonian classification of body types, "as identifiable for everybody as a fingerprint" (p. 111). Froats explains that Sheldon identified three main body types which correspond to temperament (p. 106). He later points out to Darcourt:

> You can go against your type, and probably achieve a good deal as long as you keep at it. . . . You can keep in good shape for what you are, but radical change is impossible. Health isn't making everybody into a Greek ideal; it's living out the destiny of the body. . . . But it isn't simple being yourself. You have to know yourself physiologically and people don't want to believe the truth about themselves. They get some mental picture about themselves and then they devil the poor old body, trying to make it like the picture. . . . A lot of illness comes from that. (p. 250)

By drawing on scientific studies of the body and offering a spokesman

who does not jump to conclusions, Davies lends weight to the argument that like the inner life the body is predestined.

Hollier, Darcourt, and Theotoky are absorbed by a need similar to Froats' to acquire knowledge of the relationship between man's inner reality and body. Hollier is interested in folk belief in the healing or magic powers of herbs and animal manure. He is obsessed, however, by a long lost manuscript and letters written by Rabelais, from Francis Cornish's art collection, which he hopes will yield "new insights into the link between soul and body that were the counterparts of the knowledge Ozy Froats was so patiently seeking" (p. 271). Anything but patient, Hollier asks Mamusia's help to cast an evil spell on McVarish, hoping to wrench from him the manuscript stolen from Cornish's collection. Darcourt, the "scholar-priest," is interested in the oddities of daily, academic life which he is recording but his primary aspiration is "to seek and make manifest, the wholeness of Simon Darcourt" (pp. 235,56). Darcourt's quest leads him to Gnosticism, rejected by orthodox Christianity, having discovered by experience that the "wholeness of Christ" is more important than getting "spurned and scourged," spiritually crucified, in "Imitation of Christ" (p. 56). Thus Darcourt realizes that the destiny of the spirit must not be fought against any more than that of the body. Maria Theotoky comes to a similar insight about her Gypsy heritage of spirit, mind and body. She must acknowledge and recover within herself the value of her Gypsy origins that she has learned to suppress.

Parlabane's attitude to the spirit parallels Froats' to the body

and Arthur Cornish parallels the main male characters in an interesting way. Parlabane is a sceptic about everything "but the wonder of God" (p. 201). He describes his scepticism to Darcourt as "'the crown of [his] tree,'" but "'the root is the contrary of the crown. . . . And [his] root [that feeds the crown] is romantic . . .'" (p. 203). Parlabane's scepticism parallels Froats' reluctance to commit himself to any possible outcomes from his research, other than the constancy of form he detects in faeces. Froats resembles Parlabane in being romantically enthusiastic about his interests, underneath the scepticism. Cornish's ideas about the management of mega money parallel academic "management" of knowledge. Cornish sees money as power, comparable to electricity, that may be channelled according to choice. He suggests that like the world of money, "'The University world is a power world . . .'" (p. 142). Indeed the academics are strongly aware that knowledge is power—so aware that the need to obtain or maintain that power overrules their scruples. Cornish's contrary interest is to become a grand patron of the arts; not a hoarder like his uncle but "a great animateur; . . . a begetter" of "exceptional taste" (p. 144). Thus Cornish has in common with the academics the capacity to find value where others may overlook it and the view that through that capacity he will 'immortalize' himself in this world.

Form and meaning work together in The Rebel Angels as they do in the Deptford trilogy. The narration in The Rebel Angels arises from the impulse to confess. Maria Magdalena Theotoky and Simon Darcourt, like the confessors in the Deptford trilogy, are in the process of self-judgement, or evaluation of their inner heights and

depths. Darcourt intends at the outset to write "The New Aubrey," an account of the academic world where people "[exhibit] what they are so much more freely than if they were in business, or the law, or whatever" (p. 13). He discovers, however, that his account becomes "altogether too much like a personal diary, and a confessional diary of the embarrassing sort" (p. 190). Parlabane also finds an outlet for his confessional impulse in a long and rambling novel based on his life, particularly at the College of St. John and the Holy Ghost. His motives for writing the novel are a combination of the conviction that he is entitled to public recognition of his inner value and a need to expose what he considers the truth. Like Ramsay he intends "the best of him" to survive his physical death (p. 253). Darcourt and Ramsay are content to record their side of the story for future generations, but Parlabane makes certain that his confession gets maximum attention: "if it is ignored, what of me will survive?" (p. 253). Parlabane kills McVarish and, before killing himself, sends a notice to "the three Toronto papers" and the police, giving different versions of the message that McVarish's killer had written a confessional novel about his life, Be Not Another (pp. 300,295). Thus Parlabane's obsessive need for justice leads him to injustice, murder. He takes his own life to fulfill "poetic justice (the only really satisfactory kind)," convinced that his evil deed would be explained away as insanity in modern court (p. 296).

Davies develops the main plot from two angles, the points of view of Theotoky and Darcourt, thus from a feminine and a masculine angle, uniting two subplots. Theotoky and Darcourt go through a

parallel process by emulating orthodox Christian ideals, yet eventually finding them inferior to Gnosticism which "offered their followers Sophia . . ., the feminine personification of God's Wisdom . . ." (p. 235). Thus the point of view in plot development dramatizes the masculine/feminine balance, the wholeness of their favoured religious views.

Davies brings to the surface of The Rebel Angels the subtext parallels in the Deptford trilogy between the philosopher's stone and "the stone of the filus macrocosmi which was Christ, the Wholly Good" (p. 82). He complements this parallel with the tree which is on the one hand the philosophical tree and on the other the tree of knowledge. Davies develops the subtext motifs of rebirth and the heroic battle in the Deptford trilogy by going to the roots of Western religion: Classical, Egyptian, Hebrew, European, South American. In The Rebel Angels, however, he focuses his subtext development on the Egyptian and the Hebrew roots of Christianity. Tarot cards supposedly came from the Egyptian Thoth cult and Gypsies are said to be the descendants of outcasts from the temple of Thoth. Western alchemy, according to Jung, stemmed from Egyptian alchemy, but was for some alchemists a form of unorthodox Christian devotion. The various branches of Christianity have their roots in Hebraism. Davies draws the animal symbols of the Tarot cards into the subtext, as well as having the characters frequently use animal metaphors and similies peculiar to alchemy and/or the Bible when describing themselves or other characters. To name a few of the animals mentioned in the text, the serpent, the Cancer (the crab), the scorpion, the raven, all are

animals which characters use as comparisons and all correspond to Mercurius who is both good and evil. Davies refers to Jews as perhaps "wiser than we": "Hebraism in its orthodox form, has not been so ready to abandon the Devil or his many agents . . ." (OH, p. 228). The ancient Egyptian worship of sun dieties also acknowledged an evil transcendent power. "Set" from whom "Saturn" and "Satan" are derived was a sun deity before he became the ruler of the underworld.

Davies depicts two distinct aspects of evil in The Rebel Angels. The character most often referred to in Satanic terms is Parlabane, thus emphasizing that he possesses the vital splendour, arrogance, and unruliness of Satan. Parlabane is evil and commits an evil action but he has his redemptive side: he knows that he has indulged his shadow side, knows his responsibility to a transcendent authority, and is willing to take the consequences for his actions. Parlabane's evil is cathartic, although it is the evil of "soreheaded egotists like Lucifer" (p. 257). Maria Theotoky compares Darcourt and Hollier to "the Rebel Angels" (who are winged like Mercurius and Hermes). "They were real angels, Samahazai and Azazel, and they betrayed the secrets of Heaven to King Solomon, and God threw them out of Heaven" (p. 257). She continues that they did not "plot vengeance" like Lucifer, but "gave mankind another push up the ladder, they came to earth and taught tongues, and healing and laws and hygiene—taught everything—and they were often special successes with the daughters of men" (p. 257). Later Theotoky realizes that Parlabane "was a Rebel Angel too . . ." (p. 320). Lucifer "betrayed the secrets of Heaven" to Adam and Eve—the knowledge of evil, as opposed to good. Parlabane

challenges Theotoky to confront her suppressed Gypsy side and Darcourt to confront the envy he felt towards the young Parlabane's intellect and dazzle, as well as his mature physical perfection, marred only by facial scars. More importantly, however, Parlabane commits an act that the other characters within the College were capable of committing if only they examined and knew themselves well enough. McVarish used every opportunity to be openly nasty and lecherous yet he played hide and seek with his sexual perversion. McVarish's narcissistic absorption in self-gratification which he refuses to acknowledge and his delight in nasty gossip and causing others pain, humiliation, reflect his alienation from any redeeming human values: "his fun-shop was his own mind and his own body, exclusively," says Parlabane (p. 283). Thus, unlike Parlabane, McVarish turns his face from his own evil and from God. Darcourt observes that "[i]t was widely agreed that the only way to get rid of Urky [McVarish] would be to murder him" (p. 49). Urky's evil is contagious and the college isolates him by elevating his position; Parlabane is like a collective shadow figure who restores order through evil.

Davies affirms the existence of an active God through poetic justice, represented by the dual 'stone' in the Deptford trilogy and the tree which is identical in meaning to the 'stone' in The Rebel Angels. In the trilogy, Davies emphasizes the characters' battle to break away from the Christian idea of purity, and physical and emotional suppression in search of a self that is fated to wholeness and a God from whom that wholeness springs. In The Rebel Angels, Davies examines more closely that matter in the form of dirt, the

human body, or money, obey inner laws which correspond to psychic and spiritual phenomena. The characters insist on the redeeming aspects of matter. They seek knowledge of matter, soul, and spirit for public gain, but Davies also emphasizes that selflessness is rare in human beings and their search is always strongly motivated by their private gains: public recognition of their inner values and immortality of their spirit through matter. Davies stresses that knowledge is power and inextricably bound to evil, which must be confronted in the search for the knowledge of the 'tree,' the wholeness of the 'stone.'

Chapter V

CONCLUSION

Poetic justice in Davies' novels is a psychological, an aesthetic, and a theological principle. In the Deptford trilogy, for the first time, Davies found a medium which effectively combined all three aspects. Harmony between opposites within the individual and within society, a degree of wholeness, is a central theme in the Salterton trilogy. Through Jung Davies found a symbol for wholeness: 'the stone.' The 'stone' with its various names and forms is at the core of a number of Jung's works; an archetype of the self, the center where the conscious and the unconscious unite, the 'stone' is one of the manifestations of man's religious instinct and is indistinguishable from God. The psychological framework is Jungian in the Deptford trilogy and The Rebel Angels. From the outset, however, Davies puts his mark on this framework by relating it to his own "Ornamental Knowledge" or "enthusiasms," drawing from it stylistic focus, and enhancing it with a celebration of the mixture of joy and sorrow that gives meaning to life. For Davies medium and message are one in the later works: beneath a deceptively simple surface the subtext of the 'stone' dramatizes Davies' vision of the interrelatedness of psychology, aesthetics, and theology.

The interplay between maintext and subtext in the Deptford trilogy enacts the relationship between the conscious and the unconscious, man and God, orthodox Christianity and the ideal of

wholeness in unorthodox branches of Christianity, alchemy, and the realm of dream, myth, all of which are united in a center represented by the 'stone.' The organic form of the Deptford trilogy springs from the 'stone' as a symbol of poetic justice and thus dramatizes Davies' review of religion as "an order which [is] not imposed upon life but which [arises] from it" (OH, p. 72).

NOTES

Notes

[1]Robertson Davies, The Mirror of Nature (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983), pp. 26-7. Future references to this work will be identified by initials, when necessary, and page number, thus: (MN, pp. 26-7).

[2]Robertson Davies, One Half of Robertson Davies (1978; Ontario: Penguin Books Canada Ltd., 1980), p. 269. Future references to this work will be identified by initials, when necessary, and page number, thus: (OH, p. 269).

[3]C. G. Jung, "The Syzygy: Anima and Animus," Aion, in The Collected Works of C. G. Jung, trans. R. F. C. Hull (except vol. 2, Leopold Stein), ed. Sir Herbert Read, Michael Fordham, and Gerhard Adler, Bollingen Series XX (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970), par. 42. Future references to the Collected Works will be identified by initials, volume and paragraph, thus: (CW 9i, par. 42).

[4]Robertson Davies, A Masque of Aesop (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Co. Ltd., 1952), p. 9. Future references to this work will be identified by initials, when necessary, and page number, thus: (MA, p. 9).

[5]Robertson Davies, "Hans Christian Anderson," The Enthusiasms of Robertson Davies (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1979), p. 85.

[6]Robertson Davies, Tempest-Tost (1951; Ontario: Penguin Books Canada Ltd., 1980), p. 105. Future reference to this work will be identified by initials, when necessary, and page number, thus: (TT, p. 105).

[7]Patricia Monk, The Smaller Infinity (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), p. 9.

[8]Frederick Radford, "Review Essay," English Studies in Canada 10(1984):484.

[9]Robert Scholes, Structuralism in Literature (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), p. 104.

[10]Scholes, p. 62.

[11]Jung's Symbols of Transformation was first published in 1912 in German. Souriau's dramatic functions resemble Jung's archetypes more than do Propp's spheres of action. Souriau's use of astrological signs for defining recurring patterns of characters' function within dramatic action is of particular interest in context of the Deptford trilogy. The six main functions that Souriau defines are: Mars—opposition; Moon—helper, Sun ⊙—desired object; Balance (scales)—arbiter, rewarder; Earth—ultimate beneficiary; Lion—will, one who desires (Scholes, p. 104). Davies uses nearly identical symbolism to convey action within each character, as I will discuss in Chapter 4.

[12]Northrop Frye, On Culture and Literature: A Collection of Review Essays, ed. Robert D. Denham (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), p. 123.

[13]Frye, p. 123.

[14]Robertson Davies, A Mixture of Frailties, Laurentian Library, 7 (1958; rpt. Toronto: The Macmillan Co. of Canada Ltd., 1973), pp. 116, 154. Future references to this work will be identified by initials, when necessary, and page number, thus: (MF, pp. 116,154)

[15]Robertson Davies, Leaven of Malice (1951; Ontario: Penguin Books Canada Ltd., 1983), p. 4. Future references to this work will be identified by initials, when necessary, and page number, thus: (LM, p. 4).

[16]Robertson Davies, The Manticore (1972; Ontario: Penguin Books Canada Ltd., 1982), p. 15. Future references to this work will be identified by initials, when necessary, and page number, thus: (M, p. 15).

[17]Robertson Davies, Fifth Business (1970; Ontario: Penguin Books Canada Ltd., 1982), p. 178. Future references to this work will be identified by initials, when necessary, and page number, thus: (FB, p. 178).

[18]Robertson Davies, The Rebel Angels (1982; Ontario: Penguin Books Canada Ltd., 1983), p. 177. Future references to this work will be identified by initials, when necessary, and page number, thus: (RA, p. 177).

[19]Robertson Davies, World of Wonders (1975; Ontario: Penguin Books Canada Ltd., 1980), pp. 24,33. Future references to this work will be identified by initials, when necessary, and page number, thus: (WW, pp. 24,33).

[20]Reynard the Fox, ed. Joseph Jacobs (1895; New York: Schocken Books, 1967), p.

[21]My main source for symbolic meaning is the excellent dictionary by Gertrude Jobes, Dictionary of Mythology, Folklore, and Symbols, 3 vols. (New York: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1962). Another important source is Egerton Sykes, Dictionary of Non-Classical

Mythology, Everyman's Reference Library (1952; New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. Inc., 1968). My main source for meaning of names is Flora Haines Loughead, Dictionary of Given Names: With Origins and Meaning, 2nd ed. (1933; Glendale, California: The Arthur H. Clark Co., 1958).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography

Davies, Robertson. The Ethusiasms of Robertson Davies. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1979.

---. Fifth Business. 1970. Ontario: Penguin Books Canada Ltd., 1982.

---. Leaven of Malice. 1951. Ontario: Penguin Books Canada Ltd., 1983.

---. The Manticore. 1972. Ontario: Penguin Books Canada Ltd., 1982.

---. A Masque of Aesop. Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Co. Ltd., 1952.

---. The Mirror of Nature. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983.

---. A Mixture of Frailties. Laurentian Library, 7. 1958. Toronto:

---. One Half of Robertson Davies. 1978. Ontario: Penguin Books Canada Ltd., 1980.

---. The Rebel Angels. 1982. Ontario: Penguin Books Canada Ltd., 1983.

---. Tempest-Tost. 1951. Ontario: Penguin Books Canada Ltd., 1980.

---. World of Wonders. 1975. Ontario: Penguin Books Canada Ltd., 1980.

Frye, Northrop. On Culture and Literature: A Collection of Review Essays. Ed. Robert D. Denham. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Jobes, Gertrude. Dictionary of Mythology, Folklore, and Symbols. 3 vols. New York: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1962.

Jung, C. G. The Collected Words of C. G. Jung. Trans. R. F. C. Hull (except vol. 2, Leopold Stein). Ed. Sir Herbert Read, Michael Fordham, and Gerhard Adler. Bollingen Series XX. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.

Loughead, Flora Haines. Dictionary of Given Names: With Origins and Meaning. 2nd ed. 1933. Glendale, California: The Arthur H. Clark Co., 1958.

Monk, Patricia. The Smaller Infinity. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.

Radford, Frederick. "Review Essay." English Studies in Canada 10 (1984): 476-488.

Reynard the Fox. Ed. Joseph Jacobs. 1895. New York: Schocken Books, 1967.

Scholes, Robert. Structuralism in Literature. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.

Sykes, Egerton. Dictionary of Non-Classical Mythology. Everyman's Reference Library. 1952. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. Inc., 1968.